

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1937

NOTES AND NEWS

FROM a correspondent :

'The Fifth International Congress of Papyrology was held in Oxford from August 30 to September 3 at St. John's College and the Ashmolean Museum. Over a hundred and fifty persons were present and about sixty papers were delivered, often two or three concurrently if of specialist or limited interest. The Belgian Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élizabeth has offered to print or summarize them all in a special number of the *Chronique d'Égypte*; here only those important to classical scholars in general can be mentioned.

'Most exciting perhaps was the news of a Copenhagen papyrus of Demosthenes *de Corona* containing in full the evidential documents of which our MSS give only titles (T. Larsen). The unpublished literary papyri at Brussels are unimportant (M. Hombert), but Heidelberg has fragments of Alcaeus and perhaps of Timotheus, Philemon, and Plutarch (F. Bilabel), while it is good to know that W. Schubart projects a catalogue of all published and unpublished Berlin literary papyri, and that the series *BGU* is to continue steadily (H. Kortenbeutel). Palaeographers will be interested in the sixth and seventh century papyri discovered by H. D. Colt in South Palestine (C. J. Kraemer), and A. Vogliano has won much that is new from the Herculanean rolls.

'Of importance to historians was a prosopographical study of Cornelius Gallus (R. Syme), and the *feriale*, or third-century list of official festivals celebrated by the army, discovered at Dura and brilliantly reconstructed from apparently hopeless fragments (A. S. Hoey). Another example of what patient work on fragments will achieve was a new study of Pindar's Paeans (B. Snell). Editors of literary papyri who dabble in textual criticism stand to gain from an exposure of recent blun-

ders in applying papyrus evidence to the text of Thucydides (J. E. Powell). As for reference-books, the first of six instalments of the Berlin Papyruswörterbuch is promised for late in 1938 (E. Kiessling), while the Lexicon of Patristic Greek has reached π in the first draft (D. Stone).

'The Sixth International Congress will take place at Vienna in 1939.'

A large new fascicule of the Spanish classical journal *Emerita* appeared in July, with nothing more than a change from Madrid to Valencia in its imprint to suggest that the government by whose Ministry of Education it is sponsored has graver concerns on its hands than classical studies. G. Bonfante and P. U. González de la Calle continue their studies of popular language in Horace and Horatian metre, and A. Tovar writes on the origins of the Attic legends of Pausanias; there are some eighty pages of reviews and summaries of foreign periodicals.

For the bibliographies of Greek authors which are appearing in *Les Etudes classiques* see C.R. L. 161, LI. 51. In the current number, VI. 4, Homer gets thirty pages full of careful items; if one must find a fault, it is that too little is said of editions of single books or a few. Besides much else, the same number contains a lucid synopsis of Indo-European and Latin uses of the moods, and a review of recent articles on the word-square SATOR AREPO TENET OPERA ROTAS.

A General Meeting of the Classical Association will be held in London on January 5-7. Mr. T. R. Glover will give his presidential address at London University on the 6th at 5.30 p.m.

ΑΠΑΡΙΣ.

In May 1922 I suggested to the Cambridge Philological Society an emendation of *Agamemnon* 712 which has slumbered ever since, with a very brief defence, in the decent obscurity of the Society's *Proceedings* for that year, published in 1923. Professor Gilbert Murray has now placed it in the text of the new Oxford Aeschylus, and since it will thus be forced upon the attention of scholars I wish to repeat at greater length and in a more accessible place the arguments by which I tried to justify it fifteen years ago.

It is usual, I think, in *Agam.* 681 ff. (τίς ποτ' ὠνόμαζεν . . .) to translate, in effect, 'Who named her thus, the spear-bride Helen?', taking τὴν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινεικῇ θ' Ἑλέναν as in apposition to an unexpressed αὐτήν. In 712 scholars are divided, some rendering κικλήσκουσα 'crying out upon', with τὸν αἰνόμεκτρον as a simple epithet, others, who include Wecklein, Verrall, and Headlam, taking κικλήσκουσα as 'calling, naming', with Πάριν as object and τὸν αἰνόμεκτρον as predicate. Both senses of κικλήσκω are found in Aeschylus and elsewhere in tragedy, and this use of the article with the predicate is also legitimate (see Jebb on *Ajax* 726 and Kühner-Gerth II. 1, p. 592, adding Soph. *Eurypylus* fr. 210 P., 70 ff.).

Taking the two similar phrases together, however, it is tempting to suppose that in each the adjectives (τὴν δορίγαμβρον ἀμφινεικῇ θ' and τὸν αἰνόμεκτρον) are the objects and the proper names (Ἑλέναν and Πάριν) the predicates, and to look in the second for some sort of play with the name Πάρις analogous to the preceding treatment of the name Ἑλένα, and of the noun κῆδος in 699. Verrall, who felt the need of some such verbal point, suggested that 'in choosing the contrasted name αἰνόμεκτρος Aeschylus is guided perhaps by a certain similarity, with transposition of sounds, to Ἀλέξανδρος', but he adds 'This however is of course not essential to the purpose', and the suggestion is unconvincing.

It is not easy to see in Πάρις any

such significance as Aeschylus extracts from Ἑλένα, nor is so exact an analogy really to be expected, since the chorus speak in the first instance of the original naming of Helen, at birth, while in the second they refer to a moment, after the fall of Troy, when Paris has already carried his name to the grave. What is rather to be expected is some perversion of his name, fitting the change from ὕμνος to θρήνος and expressing the new view of his character provoked by the disasters which his abduction of Helen has brought upon Troy.

Such perversions of this name are, in fact, peculiarly common in Greek poetry. In the *Iliad* Hector twice (iii 39 and xiii 769) addresses Paris thus:

Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄρσπε, γυναιμανές, ἡπεροπεντά,

and Alcman (40 Bergk = 73 Diehl) writes

Δόσπαρις, Αἰνόςπαρις, κακὸν Ἑλλάδι βωτιανέρι.

Euripides (*Hec.* 944) also uses Αἰνόςπαρις, as well as the similar form Δυσελένα (*Or.* 1388).

I suggested that in *Agam.* 712 we should emend κικλήσκουσα Πάριν to κικλήσκουσ' Ἄπαριν. For the perversion of a name by the prefix ἀ- we have *Odyssey* xviii 73

ἦ τάχα Ἴρος ἄϊροι ἐπίσπαστον κακὸν ἔξει,

and a still closer parallel in the *Etym. Magn.* gloss Ἀἴλιον · Κακοῖλιον. That Κακοῖλιον is a perversion like Δύσπαρις is known from the phrase thrice used of Odysseus by Penelope in the *Odyssey* (xix 260, 597, xxiii 19)

ᾗχετ' ἐποψόμενος Κακοῖλιον οὐκ ὀνομαστήν.

The use of this Homeric word as the explanation and the metrical shape of Ἀἴλιον (that, for instance, of πολύτροπον and of five other words in the first thirty lines of the *Odyssey*) both suggest that Ἀἴλιον may have been found somewhere in the Cycle, and Ἄπαρις may well have been found there too.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

HOMERIC EQUIVALENTS OF ΦΘΟΝΟΣ.

In his careful study of *The Jealousy of the Gods and Criminal Law at Athens* (see C.R. XLVII 223, XLVIII 174), Dr. Svend Ranulf has traced that aspect of the behaviour of gods and of men, from Homer, through early Greek writers, especially Solon and Theognis, to Sophocles and Herodotus. In Homer, he says, there is reckless indifference to human suffering, and no 'disinterested tendency to inflict punishment' on the part of a third person, himself unaffected by the wrong done. In early Hellenic writers, alongside of reckless indifference both to wrong and to suffering, there is deliberate interference, both by gods and by men, with over-prosperous and especially with overweening persons. Only in the *Eumenides* and one doubtful phrase of Pindar about ὑπέρδικος Νέμεσις, have we the beginning of a third type of behaviour, intervention to inflict 'disinterested punishment'; if it can really be called 'disinterested' to uphold a general principle, where the common interest includes one's own. It is this new notion of 'disinterested' intervention which inspires Solon's recognition of the right of any citizen to take up the cause of another in a court of law.

Reviewing Dr. Ranulf's book in the *Oxford Magazine* (24 October, 1935), I ventured to express the opinion that his statement of the case would have been more complete if he had not been satisfied with the admitted absence of the word φθόνος from the Homeric vocabulary, and had examined the Homeric usage of its cognate φθονέω, and also of words of similar import, μεγαίρω, ἄγαμαι, and νέμεσις. The transmission of words is a very fortuitous affair; the excerpts from spoken vocabulary which are enshrined in a fragmentary literature are still more accidental; and it happens that we can show how the popularity of certain words, as well as their meaning, changed between Homeric and Hellenic speech; though it is not so easy to correlate these changes with the sociological background.

The word νόμος, for example, does

not occur in Homer, but it would be unsafe to argue from this that the Homeric Age was lawless. For not only does its cognate νέμω occur often, in the sense of 'assigning' or 'distributing', but νέμεσις is there to express the feelings (and consequent action) evoked by a breach of 'assignment'; and there are the positive terms δίκη and θέμις for those formulations of 'what is done' among normal decent people, which are the raw material of what νόμος eventually meant in Hellenic speech.

Similarly λόγος occurs only twice in Homer, and always in the derogatory sense of 'talk' or 'prattle'; whereas 'reasoned speech' and 'conversation' is μῦθος, which has almost changed place with λόγος in the language of the fifth century.

What φθόνος originally meant is fairly clear from Homeric uses of φθονέω. In *Od.* II. 381 οὐκ ἂν φθονέοιμ' ἀγορεύσαι means 'I would not make less use of speech than the occasion demanded'. In *Od.* 6. 68 οὐ τοι ἡμιόνων φθονέω = 'I will not make less use of the mules than you require of me'. In *Od.* 17. 400 δὲς οἱ ἐλῶν' οὐ τοι φθονέω' κέλομαι γὰρ ἔγωγε, is permission to Antinous not to give less than Telemachus would himself give. In *Il.* 4. 55-6 Hera says to Zeus

εἴπερ γὰρ φθονέω τε καὶ οὐκ εἰὼ διαπέρσαι,
οὐκ ἂν νόω φθονέουσα', ἐπεὶ ἡ πολλὴ φέρτερος ἐσσι—

even if she wished to grant less than Zeus demands, her wish would be futile; she would have to surrender to superior force.

Like φθόνος itself, ἄφθονος does not occur in Homer. We have it however in *H. to Apollo* 536, τὰ δ' ἄφθονα πάντα παρέσται, and the stock phrase recurs in *H.* xxx. 8, together with the invocation ἄφθονε δαίμων in *H.* xxx. 16.

In Hesiod *WD.* 26 we have καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονέει, already in Dr. Ranulf's second phase of advancement.

The correlative uses of μεγαίρω in Homer are instructive; for μεγαίρω stands to μέγας as γεραίρω to γέρας, and means 'to make or deem greater' than the occasion; reaching conse-

quently the same secondary sense as *φθονέω*, but from the complementary point of view. The two words are used in Homer together; *Il.* 4. 54

τάων οὐ τοι ἐγὼ πρὸς θ' ἴσταμαι οὐδὲ μεγαίρω

refers to the same transaction as *φθονέω* in *Il.* 55-56, quoted above. In *Od.* 8. 206

ἢ πῶς ἢ πάλῃ ἢ καὶ ποσὶν οὐτι μεγαίρω

means 'I deem none of these *greater* than the others', i.e. 'it is all the same to me': compare *Od.* 3. 55

μηδὲ μεγίστης

ἡμῖν εὐχομένησι τελευτήσῃσι τάδε ἔργα,

i.e. 'deem it *greater* than we deserve'. In *Il.* 7. 408

ἀμφὶ δὲ νεκροῖσιν κατακαίμεν οὐ τι μεγαίρω·
οὐ γάρ τις φειδῶ νεκρῶν κατατεθνηῶτων | γίγνεται:

i.e. 'deem it *greater* than the occasion demands'; and the use of *φειδῶ* here suggests at least a popular association of *φθόνος* with *φειδομαι*, though there seems no linguistic ground for this. Conversely in *Il.* 23. 865

ὄρνιθος μὲν ἄμαρτε· μέγιστε γὰρ οἱ τό γ' Ἀπόλλων,

Apollo *deemed* success *greater* than might be vouchsafed, seeing that Teucer had omitted to promise sacrifice; a contingency which in later Greek would be exactly expressed by *ἐφθόνησε*, 'deemed *him* of less worth' than befitted such favour. So too in *Il.* 13. 563, *βιότοιο μεγίστης*, and *Il.* 15. 473, *Δαναοῖσι μεγίστης*, the sense is almost as close to that of *φθονήσας*, and is continuous with the use of *μεγαίρω* in Aeschylus *P.V.* 626.

Another synonym, *ἄγαμαι*, similarly cognate with *ἄγαν*, illustrates the same point, that the absence of *φθόνος* from Homeric vocabulary does not prove unacquaintance with what the word denotes. Examples are *Od.* 4. 181

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πον ἐμελλεν ἀγάσασθαι θεὸς αὐτός,

and *Od.* 5. 119

οἷρε θεαῖς ἀγάσθε παρ' ἀνδράσιν ἐνδάζεσθαι.

Such behaviour was, as we say, 'expecting too much'.

How *φθονέω* and *φθόνος*—the early existence of which is implied by the form of the Homeric verb—came to mean what they did, is less easy to say. At first sight *φθόνος* looks like a cognate of *φθίνειν*, as *κλόνος* (and *κλονέω*) of *κλίνειν* in the sense of *μάχην κλίνειν* *Il.* 14. 510, and *Τρῶας δ' ἔκλιναν Δαναοί* *Il.* 5. 37: cf. *Od.* 9. 59 *Κίκονες κλίναν δαμάσαντες Ἀχαιοῦς*. In Plato *Laws* 916A, it is not a mere popular etymology when *φθόη* is used for *φθίσις*: the series *φθει-*, *φθοι-*, *φθι-* is parallel with *λειπ-*, *λοιπ-*, *λιπ-*; and *φθόη* therefore does not help us with *φθόνος*.

The etymology of *φθόνος* is (I understand) obscure. Prellwitz *Wörterbuch* 344 says eigentlich '*Verkleinerung*'; but it seems agreed that it is not connected with *φθίνω*, *φθόη*, of which the accepted etymology is given by Boisacq, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque*. The only phonetic equivalent is an Avestan word (a present participle middle with negative prefix *a-*) which occurs only once, with various readings, and is translated 'immortal' by A. V. W. Jackson *A Hymn to Zoroaster* p. 20; *unvergängliche* by Caland, citing Jackson; and *nicht sie mindernde* by Bartholomae. I am indebted for information and references to Professor H. W. Bailey, through Professor G. E. K. Braunholtz, and to the late Roderick McKenzie. It is odd that words of so similar meaning, with their respective equivalents in Avestan and in Sanskrit (where *φθίνω* = *kṣinōti*), should be of quite different origin.

JOHN L. MYRES.

New College, Oxford.

THE LONDON MANUSCRIPTS OF ARISTOPHANES.

Plutus 119 ὁ Ζεὺς τῶν οὖν εἰδὼς τὰ τούτων μῶρ' ἐμ' εἶψ'. So runs the text of Hall and Geldart, with the note 'εἰδὼς] οἶδ' ὡς Harl. 1' (viz. Harl. 5664). Of this play in Harl. 1 the British Museum catalogue (followed by J. W. White in his list of the MSS. of Aris-

tophanes in *Classical Philology* I, 1906, p. 10) says 'desunt versus priores 234'. One might well wonder where the reading *οἶδ' ὡς* was found. Actually the report in the catalogue is false. This MS. contains on folios 76(73)-77(74) ll. 235-270, on folio 78(75) ll. 123-140

(ending at *ἦν σὺ*), and on folios 79(76)-131(128) ll. 1-1209.¹

447 ἀπολιπόντε ποι φευξόμεθα. A note in Porson-Dobree *ad loc.* seems to indicate the presence of ἀπολιπόντες in Harl. 3 (viz. Harl. 6307); so too Blaydes, but wrongly.

499 οὗτις, which is cited from the Aldine edition by Hall and Geldart, appears in Harl. 1 with οὐδείς as an interlinear gloss.

531 ἀπορούσι is the reading of Harl. 2 (viz. Harl. 5725) and Brit. Mus. Add. 12182.

547 ἀγαθὼν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἀποφαίνω σ' αἴτιον οὖσαν. Hall and Geldart have the note 'αἴτιαν codd.: corr. Bentl.' Blaydes seems to have misled the editors by his note 'αἴτιαν contra metrum libri omnes et Ald.' αἴτιον appears in Harl. 1675, which Blaydes does not seem to have used.

852 καὶ δωδεκάκις καὶ μυριάκις· ἰοὺ ἰοῦ. Hall and Geldart have the note 'καὶ ἰοὺ ἰοῦ codd.: corr. edd.' Yet, besides the MSS. cited by Blaydes, Harl. 1675 and Arundel 530 read ἰοὺ ἰοῦ without καὶ.

1029 τὸν εὖ παθόνθ' ὑπ' ἐμοῦ πάλιν μ' ἀντενποιεῖν. Hall and Geldart have the note 'μ' Mut. 2, 3: om. RVA Ald.' This statement is not true of the Aldine text. Besides the MSS. cited by Blaydes, Harl. 2, 3 (viz. Harl. 6307), Harl. 1675, Arund. 530, and Add. 12182 all contain μ'.

1082 οὐκ ἀν διαλεχθείην διεσπλεωμένη. Hall and Geldart have the note 'διεσπλεωμένη RV²A Ald.' Blaydes went astray here in giving διεσπλεωμένη to R. The facsimile of R shows no iota subscript under διεσπλεωμένη, but the iota is present in the Aldine text (as Blaydes correctly records) and also in Harl. 2, 3, and Arund. 530.

Of the six British Museum MSS. mentioned here, all with the exception of Harl. 1675 (16th century) are assigned by White to the 15th century. Add. 12182, which contains *Plutus* and *Nubes*,

has two notes attached which are worth reproducing:²

'This MS., lately brought from Constantinople and formerly in the library of Constantine Mavrocordato, contains some Scholia on both plays which have never yet been published; while those which are already in print agree with the extracts given by Dobree and Dindorf from the Leyden, Harleian, and Cambridge MSS. In the *Plutus* its readings generally coincide with the Harl. MS. 6307 and in the *Nubes* with Harl. 5725. It has never been seen by any editor and would well repay the trouble of a careful collation.' This note is unsigned.

Sir Frederic Madden wrote the second note over the initials F.M.

'In the nearly erased note prefixed to the *Plutus* I can distinguish the name of Dionysius Catilanus of Zacynthus, who appears in Montfaucon, *Palaeogr. Gr.* p. 93, as the possessor of a Greek MS. of Josephus, purchased by his father in 1581 [a query has been added here]. His name is also written at the end of the present MS.'

The statement of general coincidence in *Plutus* with Harl. 6307 needs some qualification. For the purposes of a test, about three hundred passages have been examined, with the critical apparatus of Hall and Geldart as a basis. The result of the test is to show the following agreements and divergences. The MS. differs from all the London MSS. as well as RVA and the Aldine text in 5 places³ (viz. ll. 293, 297, 438, 895, and in the distribution of lines among speakers in ll. 405-409). It agrees with Harl. 6307 against the other London MSS. in 3 places (viz. ll. 65, 454, 990), while differing in 34 places (viz. ll. 50, 111, 132 after correction, 136, 166, 197, 280, 285, 396, 428, 461, 465, 485, 531, 566, 573, 581, 583, 598, 702, 727, 765, 805, 878, 985, 988, 1005, 1011, 1012,

² In copying the notes, a few minor changes of punctuation have been made. The writer of the first note dated the MS. to the 14th century, but Sir Frederic Madden in a note suggested the 16th century.

³ Its readings are as follows: 293 and 297 βληχόμενος, 438 φνγη, 895 σν only 4 times repeated; in 405 ff. the lines are distributed thus: 405 Chrem., 406-408 Bleps., 409 Chrem., Bleps., Chrem.

¹ Blaydes in his *conspectus* of the MSS. in his edition of Aristophanes I p. LXXII makes no mention of any missing verses at the beginning of the play in this MS. Other references to Blaydes' work in the present notes are to his edition of *Plutus*.

1018, 1053, 1081, 1120, 1173). With Harl. 5725¹ it agrees against the other London MSS. in 8 places (viz. ll. 281, 461, 531, 581, 583, 985, 988, 1053), while differing in 11 places (viz. ll. 270,

438, 447, 454, 486, 505, 1018, 1030, 1052, 1173, 1183). Of the other London MSS., it agrees exclusively only once with the Arundel MS. (viz. l. 75). These figures go some way towards confirming the impression that Add. 12182 is more nearly related to Harl. 5725 than to Harl. 6307.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

¹ The mutilation of the beginning of *Plutus* in this MS. has to be taken into account in regard to this enumeration.

NEW WORDS FROM PLAUTUS.

1. *Pulto*.

In *Bacch.* 579 ff. the parasite has ordered his boy to knock at a door and is not satisfied with the result:

ut pulsat propudium!
comesse panem tris pedes latum potes:
fores pultare nescis.

There is a touch of humour in the parasite's reference to another person's voracity, but the antithesis 'You are able to eat a loaf three feet broad, but not to knock a door' is utterly pointless. The passage receives light from the fact that *panis* and *puls* are the two main varieties of food and thus frequently opposed to one another. In *Poen.* 729 Plautus has a silly pun:

si pultem non recludet? : panem frangito.

He even distorts the syntax in order to enable the interlocutor to understand the subjunctive *pultem* as an accusative of *puls* (not recorded in Lodge) and to contrast it with *panem*. In view of this parallel the antithesis of *panem* and *pultare* in our passage cannot be regarded as accidental: we must postulate the existence of a verb *pultare* derived (or understood as derived) from *puls*. The contrast with *panis* would be sufficient to make the audience aware of the ambiguity, which is supported by the alleged breadth of the loaf, three feet probably being the average width of a door. Yet it will also be noted that, although Plautus almost invariably has *pulto* (36 times; v. Lodge II 405),¹ he

uses the classical form *pulso* in 579 and 584 (*pulsatio*), which I should interpret as an attempt to bring out the pun on *pultare* more clearly by way of contrast.

The new verb *pultare* remains isolated but for a parallel from a very late source, Cummian. *lib. de mens. poenit.* 1 p. 982 D (Migne, PL 87): *in aliquo siccato cibo, aut pultato, coagulato, vel lacte*. Its supposed existence in earlier times would help to explain why *pultare* 'to knock', still used exclusively by Terence, was later entirely superseded by *pulsare* (cf. Quint. *Inst.* 1, 4, 14).

2. *Vitula*.

This *addendum lexicis* is to be restored in *Most.* 728 ff.:

musice hercle agitis aetatem, ita ut vos decet:
vino et victu probo, piscatu electili
vitam colitis : immo vita antehac erat.

In order to eke out the last line, which is one syllable short, Spengel wrote *vitam* <vos>, Redslob *vitam* <quom>; yet both conjectures, though better than Leo's *colitis* : : *Simo, vita* <ista>, are far from convincing because of their clumsiness. The metre suggests *vit*<ut>*am*, and the diminutive, naturally discarded in the reply, is indeed very well suited for a description of the *vita suavis* which the two prodigals have been leading. Similarly the parallel phrase in 728, *aetatem agere*, shows the diminutive in *Pseud.* 173 *vos quae in munditiis, mollitiis deliciisque aetatulam agitis*.

OTTO SKUTSCH.

St. Andrews.

¹ In *Epid.* 528 *multa . . . meum pectus pulsant* the verb is used in a different meaning, which may account for the difference of form. There remains one unreasonable exception, *Rud.* 332 *hanc . . . villam . . . pulsare iussisti*.

CLAUDIAN, IN RUFINUM II. 156-162.

quascunque paravit
hic Augustus opes et quas post bella recepit,
solus habet, possessa semel nec reddere curat.
scilicet ille quidem tranquilla pace fruetur,
nos premet obsidio? quid partem invadere
temptat?
deserat Illyricos fines; Eoa remittat
agmina: fraternas ex aequo dividat hastas
nec sceptri tantum fueris sed militis heres.

THE meaning of the passage depends on the political situation. Theodosius, after crushing the usurper Eugenius, had died at Milan early in 395, leaving the Empire to his sons Honorius and Arcadius. In the west the chief minister was Stilicho, in the east Rufinus, both ambitious men and bitterly jealous of each other. The eastern troops which Theodosius had led against Eugenius had been deliberately retained by Stilicho in Italy, and the eastern provinces were thus left exposed to the attacks of barbarians and of Alaric's Goths. In the spring of 395 Stilicho, at the head of the combined forces of east and west, marched into eastern territory to confront Alaric. Rufinus, as he appears in Claudian's poem, misrepresents this action to the Emperor Arcadius as evidence of Stilicho's encroachment on Constantinople and of his wish to control the whole Empire (ll. 152-3, 'geminum caeli sibi vindicat axem et nullum vult esse parem'). Among the insinuations which Claudian attributes to Rufinus is this question 'quid partem invadere temptat?' Editors, fixing on *invadere*, see in it an allegation of Stilicho's intention to invade the east. What then of *partem*?

A word so vague is unsuitable: hence editorial ingenuity has been exercised to find a better word: and so we have *Spartem* (ed. Isengrin.), *aperta* (Birt), *partum* (Brakman), *Thracam* (Koch), *Pontum* (Levy). None of these is convincing, though Levy's suggestion is both apt and in accordance with Claudian's practice of describing peoples and places by neighbouring areas of water. But amid all this, may not something be said for the vulgate reading *partem invadere*? I suggest that *invadere* has something of the sense of *avertere*, 'to make away with, embezzle, usurp'. Taken with *partem*, it means 'to jump a claim'. (Cf. Cic. *Phil.* II. 13, 'in multas praeterea pecunias alienissimorum hominum, eiectionis veris heredibus, tanquam heres esset, invaserat'; Cic. *pro Rosc. Amer.* 5, 'accusant ei qui in fortunas huius invaserunt'; Sueton. *Iul.* 9, 'ut dictaturam Crassus invaderet'.) The sense is then clear. Rufinus is suggesting that Stilicho is a fraudulent trustee who means to misappropriate the share of Theodosius' estate which really belongs to Arcadius. The significant words in the context are *solus habet: possessa: reddere: remittat: ex aequo dividat: heres*. Taken with these, and compared with the passage from the *Second Philippic* quoted above, the phrase *partem invadere* might, I believe, have the sense suggested.

W. H. SEMPLÉ.

University of Manchester.

DEMOSTHENES OL. I 21.

... οὐτ' ἂν ἐξήνεγκε τὸν πόλεμόν ποτε τοῦτον
ἐκεῖνος, εἰ πολεμεῖν ψήθη δεήσει αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ὡς
ἐπιών ἅπαντα τότε ἤλπιζε τὰ πράγματα ἀναρ-
ρῆσθαι, κῆτα δίδυσσεν.

ὡς ἐπιών has no meaning. *Uti primum invasit* (Ruediger), *primo statim impetu* (Voemel), *gleich beim ersten Angriff* (Doberenz), on his first arrival (Vince) are translations not of ὡς ἐπιών but of εὐθὺς ἐπελθὼν or ὡς ἐπῆλθε, and Reiske's explanation, repeated by successive editors, οὕτως ὡς ἐπιών τις ἀναρρίπται, is pointless, both because all aggressors must ἐπένειναι, whether the subsequent war is long or short, and because Philip actually was an ἐπιών and cannot therefore be compared to one. Fuhr

replaces ὡς by Fox's εὐθέως, which however has little probability. A simple remedy would be to regard ἀλλ' ὡς as ἄλλως, and write either <ἀλλὰ> ἄλλως ἐπιών or ἄλλως <δ'> ἐπιών, 'by his simple arrival'. But apart from the idiom τὴν ἄλλως, Demosthenes elsewhere uses ἄλλως 'merely' only to qualify nouns (19, 24 ὅχλος ἄλλως καὶ βασκανία; 35, 25 ἄλλως ὄθλον καὶ φλυσιαν), although there are three passages in Herodotus which show it used with verbs and at the same time illustrate the origin of this meaning: 3, 16, 7 αἱ ἐντολαὶ οὐ μοι δοκοῦσι ἄρχην γενέσθαι, ἄλλως δ' αὐτὰ Αἰγύπτῳ σέμνοιν; 3, 139, 3 ταύτην πωλέω μὲν οὐδενὸς χρήματος δίδωμι δὲ ἄλλως; 5, 8 θάπτονται κατακαύσαντες ἢ ἄλλως γῇ κρύψαντες (where, as κατακαλεῖν is not a method of γῇ κρύπτειν, δ. cannot mean 'otherwise').

I therefore suggest ἀλλ' <ἀπλ> ὡς, com-

paring 8, 5 οὐκέτι δὲ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς εἰρήνην ἀκτέον; 18, 235 ὑπεύθυνος ὦν οὐδενί, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς αὐτὸς δεσπότης πάντων; 19, 7 ὁ τὸν νόμον τιθεὶς οὐ διώρσεν τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς εἶπε μηδαμῶς δῶρα λαμβάνειν; also 277; 21, 190; 23, 50; 60; 75; 143; 29, 11.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

NOTES ON THE JERUSALEM PALIMPSEST OF EURIPIDES (SABAE 36).

H. O. COXE: Report to Her Majesty's Government on the Greek Manuscripts yet remaining in libraries of the Levant, p. 55, nr. 22. London, 1858.

F. C. TISCHENDORF: Anecdota Sacra et Profana (2nd ed.), p. 223. Leipzig, 1861.

A. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ: Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη. Vol. I, p. 108 (with seven photograph plates). ἐν Περουπόλει, 1891.

K. HORNA: Der Jerusalemer Euripides-palimpsest; in *Hermes*, 64 (1929), p. 416.

THROUGH the courtesy of Vassilios Semonides, Archbishop of Ascalon and Librarian to the Greek Patriarchate in Jerusalem, I was enabled to obtain photographs of this ms on the occasion of my last visit there in March of this year. The photographs were taken by the photographer Michael Savvides of Jaffa Road, Jerusalem. I hope to present completely indexed sets of these photographs to the principal libraries in due course. Meanwhile I am glad to be able to say this at once, since after the publication of Cox's Report each student of this ms has found fault with his predecessor in matters of fact, and these should now be made verifiable without the necessity of a journey to Jerusalem. Nevertheless a new direct collation on the original will have to be undertaken sooner or later.

I hope to complete my own collation of the photographs next winter. Meanwhile the following preliminary notes may perhaps be of interest.

Pp. 313 and 314 of the ms, hitherto unidentified and undeciphered,¹ contain *Med.* 1278-1376.

On p. 313 the following readings occur: 1285 ἐξέπειπεν, 1286 πιτνεί (πίτνει V), 1291 γυναικῶν λέχος πολύπονον (λέχος πολ. γυν. V), 1295 τοῖσδε γ' (as V), 1298 τυράννων (as V), 1299 τυράννους (as V), 1303 ἐκσῶσαι (as p). They confirm the impression gained from the other surviving pages that H is not so close to V as Papadopoulos-Kerameus supposed.²

Papadopoulos-Kerameus and Horna both give *Or.* 105-412 as one of the surviving fragments. Unfortunately the lines *Or.* 214-312 are not preserved in the ms.

Half of p. 343, bearing *Or.* 1176-1200, and half of p. 439 with *Hipp.* 469-493, have hitherto passed unnoticed.

Among the new readings is *Hec.* 907 τοῖον Ἑλλάνων: King (in 1726) here conjectured τοῖον (not τοῖον as Wecklein gives): Brunnck (1780) gives τοῖον: Dindorf (1839) gives τοῖον as

the reading of 'Florentini quatuor', and Kirchhoff (1855) quotes Laur. 31, 10 (his 'c') as having τοῖον. *Or.* 900 ὁσιῶν is obviously a reminiscence from v. 515. *Or.* 906 ἀστῶν was a conjecture of Valckenaer.

J. A. SPRANGER.

Florence.

THAYΓΕΤΟΣ.

THE literary problem in *τηλέγερος* is to determine what basic meaning it had to the Greek poets using it. Here folk-etymology, but hardly Indo-European theories, may help.¹

The difficulty is that in the extant contexts *τ.* has two apparently unrelated meanings. In the less ambiguous Epic passages its meaning ranges from *dear, darling, to coddled, cowardly*. But in Euripides, Hesychius (citing some unknown comic poet), and Simmias, *τ.* clearly means *born far away, distant*. Unless the second tradition be mere catachresis some reconciliation with the Homeric meaning, and, if possible, with a popular etymology, must be achieved. The new edition of L. and S. does not attempt this.

All the existing explanations of meaning and derivation have been challenged. But I think a better case can be made for the old ὁ τηλοῦ ἀποδημήσαντι τῷ πατρὶ γεννηθεῖς, i.e. *τηλέγονος*.²

The obvious objection is that *born in the absence of one's father* fails to explain *dear, coddled, cowardly*. But is this so? A father may well become unusually affectionate towards a child long known only by report ('Absence makes . . .'). On the other hand in the absence of masculine discipline a mother might easily spoil and effeminate the child before his father's return. Such long campaigns would, perhaps, be unusual. But allowing the extension of meaning from *born to kept away from one's father, i.e. reared by the women*, the interpretation stands. Achilles at Lycomedes' court was a *τηλέγερος* in this sense. Perhaps some Mother's Darling, or Concealed Heir, motif may lurk in the word (compare Theseus at Troezen).

So I suggest that the primary meaning of *τ.* was *born away from, distant from, one's father* in the case of children,³ *from one's country or from Greece* (with less emphasis on *born*) in the case of adults and things; the secondary meanings in the case of children were *reared by women, spoilt, cowardly*, but also *dear, darling, to the father*.

As a *Volksetymologie* τηλοῦ γεγονώς is an obvious and plausible choice.

W. BEDELL STANFORD.

Trinity College, Dublin.

¹ See Boisacq, Buttmann's *Lexilogus*, and new and earlier editions of Liddell and Scott for full references.

² See schol. 8, 11, and, on *Proculus*, Plut. *Coriol.* 11, and Paul. ex Fest. p. 225 (Müller).

³ For the practice of naming after the father's condition compare Telemachus, Megapenthes, Odysseus.

¹ Horna, p. 419.

² Horna, p. 428.

LUCAN II 508f.

503 *ingreditur pulsa fluvium statione uacantem*
Caesar, et ad tutas hostis compellitur arces.

NEITHER Lucan nor Caesar (bell. ciu. i 16) definitely states that the bridge over the river on the road to Corfinium was secured and used by the invading army, but this is clearly the intention of both accounts. The expression *ingreditur fluvium* therefore becomes difficult, or at any rate in need of explanation.

It seems at first sight possible to avoid the difficulty by understanding *fluvium* in a comprehensive sense; the problem in Caesar's path consists in fact of river, bridge and bridge-guard. Thus Mr. Duff translates 'driving back the guard, Caesar occupies the undefended stream.' If the poet intended this he would perhaps have done better to use some such word as *occupat*; since the casual reader is only too likely to understand *ingreditur* in its literal sense, especially if he has the account of the passage of the Rubicon (i 220) fresh in his memory.

It has been suggested to me that Lucan may have had in mind the juristic use of the words *ingredior* and *uacans*, meaning them to be taken closely together; so that Caesar would be regarded as 'stepping into vacant property'. This appears rather to increase the difficulty, for it would imply that Caesar had a more than passing interest in the occupation of the river-crossing. It seems better, too, to avoid anything that would produce the effect of a check

in the sequence of events in a passage where Lucan appears to be imitating the rapidity of his model. Thus the description of the enemy's withdrawal into the fortress (504), which is three miles distant from the bridge (Caesar *loc. cit.*), conveys the impression that it takes place under the immediate pressure of Caesar's action. It should be remembered in this connection that the defence is placed on the further bank (502 *trans ripam*).

The situation would be simplified if it could be clearly stated that Caesar crosses the river, leaving the method of crossing to be understood, as it is in his own account. For *ingreditur*, therefore, we may perhaps read *egreditur*. The word would have to be justified in the sense which is proper to it in its transitive construction, that of 'fines certos transgredi'; some support for this may be found in 487 *hoc limite* and 497 *stabit iam flumine . . . in ullo*. Lucan uses the word elsewhere in this construction: v 510 *tentoria . . . egressus*, vii 594 *iuris . . . humani columen . . . egressus*. Compare the somewhat similar use of *euado*: Tac. ann. 12, 35 *annem . . . haud difficulter euadit* (a situation very like the present); Verg. aen. 6, 425 *euadit . . . ripam*.

Textually it is a fairly easy correction; one need only suppose obliteration or misreading (i for e) of the first letter of the line; and even apart from this possibility *egreditur* might offer some temptation to an interpolator.

W. M. EDWARDS.

University of Leeds.

REVIEWS

THE PROMETHEUS AND TRILOGIES.

H. MOELLER: *Untersuchungen zum 'Desmotes' des Aischylos*. Pp. 72. Greifswald: printed by H. Adler, 1936. Paper.

F. STOESSL: *Die Trilogie des Aischylos. Formgesetze und Wege der Rekonstruktion*. Pp. 264. Baden bei Wien: Rohrer, 1937. Paper, (export price) RM. 27.

DR. MOELLER's thesis is directed against the view that the *Prometheus* is by a later and inferior poet deliberately opposing Aeschylus's interpretation of the myth. Its genuineness is disputed on grounds of (1) language and metre, (2) stage-technique, (3) treatment of the subject. M. sets himself to refute (3) only, saying with some reason that for (1) the data are insufficient for reliable conclusions, and referring to other scholars for explanation of the special character of (2). He claims that *P.V.* represents a

'Weltanschauung' thoroughly and characteristically Aeschylean; that it shows a close parallel with the other plays in its modification and interpretation of mythology, its types of character, its conception of tragedy, and in minor points such as the author's geographical, etymological and other learned interests.

The onus of proof rests with the sceptics, who have certainly failed to make a case. M. has no difficulty in showing that this play fits in well with all that we can deduce as to Aeschylus's attitude and personality, and his exposition is in itself a sound piece of work. As polemics, it suffers from the weakness of the opposition in this sector and from the impossibility of comparative study in the absence of any contemporary drama. His parallels, significant and insignificant, are accumulated somewhat indiscriminately and occasionally pressed too far; e.g.

(p. 62) the Oceanids' resolve to share Prometheus' fate is compared with the attitude of the semi-chorus in the last act of the *Septem*, and this 'striking resemblance' is claimed to assure the genuineness of both; also (pp. 39 ff.) it is declared that in no play of Aeschylus does freedom of will play a part in the dramatic action: suffering is inevitable, and the sufferer's only choice lies between proudly accepting an evil and being pushed into it in fear and lamentation. It depends on the sense given to 'part in the action'; Aeschylus stresses strongly enough Prometheus' and Agamemnon's *original* freedom of choice in the decisive action of their lives.

The second book is an elaborate attempt to discover a principle of trilogic composition in the *Oresteia* which can then be shown to work in all Aeschylean trilogies. To avoid a *petitio principii* the missing parts of these must be reconstructed on quite independent grounds (in default of other evidence by the study of 'loci rudimentales' in other plays, after Zieliński), and we can then see if they support the principle. The formula is discovered to be *aab*, like the Pindaric strophe—antistrophe—epode, the first two plays being either straightforwardly or inversely parallel. Parts of *Ag.* are only explicable as 'counterweights' to keep the action parallel with *Cho.*, the middle play having here set the norm. The Danaid trilogy is reconstructed, contrary to tradition, in the order *Suppliants*, *Danaids*, *Egyptians* (the Egyptians, though previously murdered, dominate the action, which closely resembles that of *Eum.*). Some scenes of the *Suppliants* can only be explained as following the lead of the second play, while certain unusual features conjectured in the *Danaids* derive from the *Suppliants*. The parallelism is much closer than in the *Oresteia*, allowing even choruses to match; probably Aeschylus modified this stiff archaic symmetry as his art developed. The *Prometheus Lyomenos* works out scene by scene in inverse order parallel to the *Desmotes* (an added proof of the early date of the latter), with the chorus of Titans singing hymns of hate corre-

sponding to the Oceanids' songs of sympathy. Oceanus, an otherwise inexplicable intrusion in *P.V.*, is in responson to Ge in the *Lyomenos*. The trilogy of 472 B.C. contains three plays unconnected in subject, but here again a *Phineus* which corresponds scene by scene with the *Persae* can be reconstructed out of Apollonius's epic (this suggests to the author a wide and fruitful field for future research). The Thebaid trilogy requires a long detour: first over Sophocles' *Antigone*, the analysis of which shows a drama of romantic love, with an emotional conflict to which the burial motive and conflict of wills are simply introductory exposition, so full of pointless contradictions that here must be embedded the 'rudimentary' remains of an earlier version of the story; since the closing scene of the *Septem* is hardly full enough to supply this, both must derive from a prior source: next, the *Laius* and *Oedipus* are reconstructed by an examination of *O.T.* and *O.C.* and prove to be also composed in responson.

The best of this book lies in the detailed criticisms of other scholars' theories, especially the excellent notes refuting Schmid on *P.V.*, and it contains some penetrating incidental observations. But the reviewer confesses to an extreme scepticism as to the validity of the method as a whole. The theme of the *Oresteia* gives of itself a general *aab* sequence of action, but as applied scene by scene even here the formula strains and cracks. And in the reconstructions it is difficult to take seriously S.'s somewhat artless contention that he has proceeded without looking at the formula and only opened his eyes at the end, to find that it fits beautifully. The same applies to his test of the 'rudimentary' method, when he reconstructs with 'zwingender Logik' the *Choephoroe* (without looking) from an analysis of the two *Electras*. A Greek poet's reasons for introducing a character or giving a turn to the action cannot be decided simply on grounds of 'dramatic technique' in the German sense, with the 'rudimentary' theory ready to step in wherever this does not seem to work straightforwardly; the obvious and old-fashioned

psychological interpretation, for instance, can account more intelligibly for the part played by Chrysothemis, or Ismene, or Electra's husband. But the chief objection to S.'s method is the enormous excess of speculation and

assumption over actual evidence in his arguments; one cannot rear a two- and three-story building on hypothetical foundations.

A. M. DALE.

Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

VERSIONS OF EURIPIDES.

1. *Four Dramas of Euripides* (Hecuba, Heracles, Andromache, Orestes) translated into English Verse by H. O. MEREDITH. Pp. 253. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

2. Euripides' *Ion* translated with notes by H. D. Pp. xi + 132. London: Chatto and Windus, 1937. Cloth, 6s.

1. THESE translations from Euripides by a Professor of Economics should make professed students of the classics look to their laurels, for they are the most interesting which have appeared for a long time. They have the outstanding merit that the translator has thought out more precisely than most what he meant to do, and why; and he has wide experience in the production of Greek plays in English to guide him in his choice of method. He explains his principles in an admirable introduction. In this he makes several good points, but the most important is that in Euripides the tone varies much more than in Aeschylus and Sophocles, and varies not only in different plays but in different scenes of the same play. And there is the same kind of variation in the lyrics as in the dialogue. Any translation therefore which preserves a uniform style throughout, whatever that style may be, is inevitably false in tone at times. Moreover, as the various types of speech are more numerous in English, and the divisions between them wider than in Greek, the differences of style and diction will be more conspicuous in a translation than in the original. It is obvious that a translation on these principles demands real scholarship and feeling for language, but Professor Meredith comes through the test well. We may differ here and there with his interpretation, for, as he himself allows, the tone of a particular passage is often open to dispute, but he leaves us in no doubt

how he means it to be taken. He has decided just what the speaker means to convey and tries to express it, and so gives his dialogue unusual life and reality. It follows that he is more studious to translate the thought than the form. Thus *Andromache* 183-5

φεῦ φεῦ·
κακὸν γὰρ θνητοῖς τὸ νέον ἔν τε τῷ νέῳ
τὸ μὴ δίκαιον ὅστις ἀνθρώπων ἔχει

becomes

'Alas! poor mortals!
Youth is a difficult time, most difficult
Where youth is coupled with contempt for
reason.'

This has just the right tone and expresses delightfully what is in Andromache's mind, but it is obviously a very free translation. I quote the words to illustrate the method, not to cavil, for it is justified by the result. Sometimes however it is hard to see how the English is extracted from the Greek, or the Greek is strained to make a point: e.g. 'Such a good speech, but it did not carry them' is hard to extract from ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔπειθ' ὄμιλον, εὖ δοκῶν λέγειν (*Or.* 943), for εὖ δοκῶν can hardly refer to the messenger's opinion of the speech.

In his introduction the translator gives some interesting and cogent reasons in favour of the metres used, blank verse for the dialogue, and various rhyming metres for the lyrics. In both he writes well, but here and there a word creeps in which is not quite in tone with the rest of the passage, or otherwise displeasing; 'gifted' for 'given,' for instance, is not a pretty word. But on such points ears differ, and the translator may perhaps plead that Euripides himself is not quite free from such slips. Each play is prefaced by a note on the characters and suggestions for lighting. These notes, though intended mainly

for the actor and producer, often stimulate thought, and the best of scholars will gain something from them, as from the rest of the book.

2. H. D.'s version of the *Ion* is in what the translator describes as 'evocative *vers-libre*.' It could perhaps better be described as a kind of hysterical shorthand; for the writer condenses the trimeters of Euripides into lines of two or three syllables, which he (or she) believes to be the equivalent or, to use his own phrase (p. 32), 'the exact antithesis' of the original. By this method lines 271-8 become:

Ion.—yes, in pictures—

Kreousa.—Kekrop's daughters—

Ion.—had a basket—

Kreousa.—but their neglect—

Ion.—caused their own death—

Kreousa.—Erekhtheus—

Ion.—from the great cliff—

Kreousa.—hurled the sisters—

It is not necessary to give a specimen of the lyrics, for they do not differ perceptibly in form or style from the dialogue. The translation is freely interspersed with notes. These consist partly of elementary and occasionally misleading information, partly of stage directions and general comments, of which the following is an average specimen (it precedes the translation of l. 258): 'A woman is about to step out of stone, in the manner of a later Rodin. It is impossible, at this moment, not to swing forward into a—to fifth-century Greece—distant future. This poetry rises clean cut today. . . .'

From these specimens the reader will be able to judge for himself the value and character of the book.

F. R. EARP.

THE FATHER OF HISTORY.

Max POHLENZ: *Herodot, der erste Geschichtschreiber des Abendlandes*. (Neue Wege zur Antike, II. Reihe, Heft 7/8.) Pp. 222. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1937. Paper, (export price) Rm. 6.90.

BOTH in style and in format this is a pleasant book to read. It contains much acute analysis, especially of the last three books of H., much that is illuminating on particular points, such as the significance of *ιστορίη* and *λόγος*, H.'s political and religious ideas, his debt to the Attic drama in general and to Aeschylus in particular, the relation of the individual to destiny in his work.

But judged as polemic—and the work is primarily polemical—it does not carry conviction. It aims at establishing H.'s right to be called the father of history, but seems to proceed on the assumption that for this purpose it is necessary to prove that the whole work was composed from start to finish with one end in view, namely the portrayal of the struggle between East and West which culminated in the expedition of Xerxes. This unitarian hypothesis is made explicitly on p. 20: 'Dann sollte man aber auch nicht verkennen, dass dieser Xerxes-zug das Ziel ist, auf das alles Vorhergehende hinstrebt, dass das

ganze Werk, wie es uns vorliegt, im Hinblick auf dieses Ziel komponiert und von dem gleichen Leitmotiv beherrscht ist.'¹ P. in effect denies that it is possible to trace any development in H.'s thought from a stage when his interest was primarily ethnological-geographical to a stage when it was primarily historical.²

He is well aware that the main obstacle to this unitarian hypothesis lies in the *content* of the *λόγοι* of the earlier books. He recognizes that these *λόγοι* are in a sense self-contained units and that the vital question is whether they were originally composed for the present work, for some other work, or each for its own sake (p. 73). It is therefore surprising that he devotes considerable space in the early part of his book to showing how the

¹ It is difficult to reconcile this with the statement on p. 78 relative to the Scythian and Libyan *λόγοι*: 'Diese zeigen offensichtlich den besonderen Stil der Periege und sind nicht durch das historische Leitmotiv bestimmt.' P. admits that these are exceptions, but he makes no reference to them in the earlier passage.

² His reluctance to accept this hypothesis may be partly due to over-simplification, as when on p. 78 he combats the view that H. had at one period '*rein* geographische Interessen' (my italics).

λόγοι were built as units into the existing work. It is fruitless, for example, to refer, as P. does on p. 14, to passages in I 171, II 1, III 1 as evidence that throughout these books H. always has his main theme in mind. These very same passages are cited by Jacoby as evidence of the small influence exercised by the main theme on the content and arrangement of the early books.¹ The ingenuousness of this part of P.'s argument reaches a climax when on p. 67, after calling attention to H.'s 'ungeheure Erlebnissfähigkeit, die seine Erkundung immer weiter führt,' he adds 'aber niemals lässt er sich von dieser Neigung hemmungslos treiben, stets findet er den Weg zum Thema zurück.'

Again, in dealing with those passages in the early books which concern the history of the Greek cities in Europe he never squarely faces the question whether a writer who was setting out to give an account of a struggle between East and West would have disposed of his material in this way. It shows a characteristic misconception of possible alternative views when on p. 39 he says of these passages that they are 'ganz und gar nicht willkürlich eingestreute Einzelheiten.'² We can surely agree without being committed to the unitarian hypothesis.

Matters are not mended when we turn to P.'s treatment of the vital question, the content of the λόγοι. P. himself gives an excellent summary on p. 70 of the function we should expect them to perform. 'Alles, was irgendwie für das Verständnis der Haupthandlung,

für die Klärung der Situation, für die Einordnung von Personen oder Dingen, die neu in das Blickfeld des Lesers treten, wichtig ist, muss mitgeteilt werden.' Can it really be said that judged by this test the Egyptian λόγος³ was originally intended to be part of an introduction to the expedition of Xerxes? P. seems to have persuaded himself that it can, for after remarking on p. 71 that the anecdote of the treasure of Rhampsinitus and the crocodile-hunt are more interesting to H. than the rule of the Hyksos and the Egyptian constitution he goes on: 'trotzdem hat grundsätzlich innerhalb von Herodots Werk der Αἰγύπτιος λόγος die gleiche Funktion wie das Sonderkapitel über Karthago innerhalb von Mommsens Römischer Geschichte.' Would it be too strong to say that if we could imagine H. subscribing to this last sentence we should have to deny him the title of historian altogether?

In fact it is precisely the conviction that H. was a historian which makes it so difficult to believe that he wrote the λόγοι of the earlier books for the work as it now stands. After all, a sense of proportion is one of the primary requirements for writing history, and in looking for it in H. we are not (*pace* P. on p. 177) applying to him a purely modern standard; we are not even applying a standard first set by Thucydides. We are applying a standard which H. himself attained in his last three books.

A. R. W. HARRISON.

Merton College, Oxford.

¹ *R.E.* Suppl. 2, col. 336.

² My italics.

³ P. himself seems to abandon the Scythian and Libyan λόγοι.

THE THUCYDIDEAN QUESTION.

Harald PATZER: *Das Problem der Geschichtsschreibung des Thukydides und die thukydideische Frage*. Pp. vi+118. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen.) Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1937. Paper, RM. 5.20.

THE problem of how and when Thucydides composed his history has continued acute ever since Ullrich started it in 1845. In the last decades

Schwartz, Pohlenz and Schadewaldt seemed to have come near to perfecting a reconstruction of his development based on the successive stages of his work. But Germany at present is experiencing a reaction from such criticism and has begun putting the classics together again as industriously as it took them apart, so that the English, who have always had a distaste for compositional

analysis, are now in with the fashion again. They are sure therefore to welcome Patzer, who reverts to the position once held by Classen and Meyer and tries to show that apart from notes Thucydides wrote none of his work before 404 and that the analysts have been chasing a will-o'-the-wisp.

P. has a firm grasp of the problem and its literature, and he expounds his views with a logic and clarity which put his book above the average of German dissertations. But his siege-train is inadequate to the fortress he has undertaken to demolish.

1. He says nothing that removes the *a priori* improbability that Thucydides remained idle for years after 421, when no one could yet foresee that the Peace of Nicias was destined to be short-lived. Passages in which the 'late' Thucydides refers to this period as part of *ὁ πόλεμος* do not prove the contrary (pp. 18 ff.; 63 f.).

2. To the detailed argumentation of Schwartz P. opposes (p. 10) only the alleged proof of Pohlenz that the four speeches 1, 67-86 refer to one another and are therefore 'late'. But the valid references are all from the 'late' to the 'early' pair, not *vice versa*; so that Pohlenz has only proved against Schwartz that Thucydides himself and not his editor combined the two pairs.

3. Unless Thucydides' history is no more than a half-digested diary, demonstrably early sentences cannot be dismissed as taken over inadvertently from contemporary notes (pp. 15; 31 n.; 107).

4. The decisive testimony of the self-corrective 'second proem' (5, 26) in its present position cannot be thrust aside with the simple remark that 'proems to sections of a longer work are nothing remarkable' (p. 23).

5. The inappropriateness of proving the greatness of the Peloponnesian War after 404 by the catalogue of horrors in 23, 1-3 is not removed (pp. 66 ff.) by denying that this is the purpose of the otherwise irrelevant catalogue, or by pointing to *μέγα μῆκος*, which in a comparison with the Persian invasion is as suitable to the Archidamian as to the Twenty-Seven Years' War.

6. The 'programme' 1, 22, 1 is not to be brought into harmony with all the speeches by paraphrasing *ἡ ξύμπασα γνώμη τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων* 'selbst dann forschte er nach dieser γνώμη, um sie und nur sie darzustellen, wenn sie in Wirklichkeit kaum oder gar nicht zum Ausdruck gekommen war' (p. 53), or by interpreting *τὰ δέοντα περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων* to mean 'die Reden sollen die Situationen selbst in ihrem Gehalt an Forderungen für die politische Einsicht sichtbar machen' (p. 40).

5, 26, 2 is misconstrued on p. 75, and 7, 30, 3 on p. 69 n. The remarks on 4, 56, 2 in the note on p. 15 are nonsense, and the interpretation of *τὰ δέοντα εἰπεῖν* 1, 22, 1 as *τὰ δέοντα (πρᾶξαι) εἰπεῖν* is monstrous (p. 40). An average of one misprint to a page is too high.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

PARATACTIC COMPOSITION IN THE OLDEST GREEK.

B. A. VAN GRONINGEN: *Paratactische compositie in de oudste Griekse literatuur*. Pp. 32. (Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Deel 83, Serie A, No. 3). Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers-Maatschappij, 1937. Paper, f. 0.60.

PLATO demanded that a literary work should have the unity of a living organism; the parts should be consistent with one another and subordinate to the whole. This demand springs from the

new rhetoric, which was all for rule and system. The 'pre-classical' method of composition was not organic or hypotactic but paratactic. The 'parts' tend to be autonomous, and the 'whole' is not a genuine whole but a 'dossier'. Such 'wholes' have neither true beginning nor true end. They are arbitrarily chosen portions of larger 'wholes' (as the *Iliad*, itself episodic, is only an episode in the Trojan War). And this is true even if the whole piece be 'framed' or 'boxed' with prologue and

epilogue; for these mark no essential delimitation of the subject-matter. The unity—if there be unity in such a work—is due to the fact that the essentially disparate parts are ingeniously stitched together by devices such as recurring lines, transitions, echoes and foreshadowings. Professor Van Groningen draws support from Alcman's *Partheneion*, the *Hymn to Apollo*, Hesiod, Xenophanes (who actually begins a poem with a transitional line), and, above all, Semonides, who is revealed by his poem on women as a master of the paratactic technique.

What then of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*? The characteristic features of paratactic composition are to be found in both poems. Homer's aim is the perfection of the parts rather than the integrity of the whole; he thinks more of variety and abundance than of qualitative selection and the orderly disposition of the parts. To attack the unity of either poem because of the paratactic features, or to defend their unity on the ground that each is an

organic and well-knit structure, betrays a concern for literary canons which are irrelevant in the field of pre-classical Greek literature.

My summary does scant justice to the force and subtlety of this brief but important essay. The author has emphasized with fine clarity and erudition a point of view which needs to be expressed. May one hope that he will deal, at greater length and not merely in the pre-classical field, with the relation between paratactic and organic unity? I take it that in his view they are not mutually exclusive. Perhaps, as literature develops, organic pattern is increasingly superimposed on sheer agglutinative parataxis; and a poem becomes, like a tree, a thing which combines elongation with proportion. If that be so, one may understand why Aristotle, who disliked the episodic ('paratactic'), was so much impressed by the organic unity of the admittedly episodic *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE AXIOCHUS.

E. H. BLAKENEY: *The Axiochus* | On Death and Immortality | A Platonic Dialogue | Edited with translation, illustrations and notes. Pp. 48. London: Frederick Muller, 1937. Quarter-cloth, 5s.

THE translation is a good and readable piece of English and clearly the best portion of the book. Besides omissions (as at 366c 5), there are some other blemishes of no great importance. For example, at 364b 3 (my references are of necessity to the Oxford text) δὲ means 'Then', not 'But', which spoils the narrative; at 365b 3 κατήκοος λόγων does not mean 'amenable to argument', but that Axiochus had been a student in his day; and at 372a 1 'Here too are to be found those who . . . are . . . worn out by everlasting punishments' (Burgess in Bohn's Library made the same mistake) should be 'Here . . . they [the impious of the preceding sentence] are worn out' etc.

Other faults, at first sight more serious, are due to that strange doom which drives so many translators to

print one text and translate another. Mr Blakeney's printed text is (though he does not say so) almost entirely Hermann's, but one cannot specify the text which he translated. Thus at 367b 6 'Some, in old age, are still in full vigour, bodily' etc. is a really good attempt to translate a recognizable reading of some difficulty (as in Burnet). But the printed reading (mostly as in Hermann) actually means 'Most men in old age lose their vigour' etc. Contrariwise ἐπικλυσιν (368c 4, Hermann's reading) is translated, and ἐπικανσιν (Burnet's) is printed. At 370d 4 κακῶν ἀγονος becomes 'with no taste of ill', the very words of Burgess, who, however, did not omit to note that he was substituting ἀγευστος. At 370e 2 Hermann's κάμπαλιν is printed and καὶ πάλαι translated. Other examples are 370c 1-3, and ὥρακίας at 364b 5, invented by Hermann, here printed but omitted from the 'Select Glossary' which concludes the book.

Mr Blakeney consulted no annotated edition save Bekker's. The excellent

work of J. Souilhé (XIII, 3 of the Budé Plato) receives no mention. Rightly or wrongly, however, it has not been Mr Blakeney's aim to discuss the argument or explain the text. His strong point is the collection of references to 'parallels' drawn from a wide range of reading. For example, on the Areopagus he refers to *Ath. Pol.* and *Acts* xvii 19, but without any warning that these two texts concern two bodies which have nothing in common save the name; it might also have been well to add that the functions which the *Axiochus* ascribes to the Areopagus are not mentioned in *Ath. Pol.*, and are possibly one of several indications that this dialogue is much later than 'the second or third generation after Plato'. Again, on the allegedly Orphic character of the *Axiochus*, Mr Blakeney refers to Mr Guthrie on Orphic beliefs, including 'the doctrine of birth-cycles'. It would surely have been advisable to add that in the *Axiochus* there is nothing about birth-cycles any more than about vegetarianism; and the inference to be inevitably drawn from Mr Guthrie's invaluable work is that the 'Orphism' of this typically syncretistic dialogue is,

at most, only skin-deep. To summarize my impressions: when the 'plain of truth' (371c 2) recalls 'Jerusalem, my happy home'; when the bronze tablets of the Hyperboreans (371e 5), the stone tablets of the Torah and the golden plates of the Mormons are lumped together; when Plato's theocracy is said to resemble atheistic 'Sovietism'; when it is stated that Orphism was 'revivalism in Greek religion', and that (in so many words) its 'regeneration' 'was accomplished through sacramental grace', I cannot but think it a pity to exaggerate superficial resemblances at the expense of essential differences.

There are some slips, as, for example, when Clisthenes is called 'an early sixth-century reformer'; and some completely perplexing notes, e.g. on 366a 2: 'Wisdom V, 8-13. In the next paragraph there seems to be some dislocation in the Greek'.

The book 'is intended not for the learned but for learners'. While distrusting the antithesis, I should be inclined to put it the other way round.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

THE PRIVATE SPEECHES OF DEMOSTHENES.

Demosthenes: *Private Orations*, with an English translation by A. T. MURRAY. In three volumes. I. Pp. xi + 523. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THIS is an unpretentious work, which gives the ordinary student a readable and straightforward version of the current text of the Private Orations. Nothing is said of the manuscripts and there is no apparatus, but the few divergences from Blass, other than the omission of bracketed words and the like, are indicated at the foot of the page. The notes are mostly short and sensible. The very brief general introduction might well have emphasized more strongly the differences between Athenian and English courts, and especially the fact that the dicasts combined most of the functions of judge and jury. Murray, though careful and

conscientious, is not exceptionally alert, and sometimes slides over difficulties.

The few detailed criticisms which follow are mostly confined to the speech which I happen to know best, the *Pro Phormione*. Something might have been said in the special introduction to this speech of its probable date, which can be deduced within limits from the known date of Pasion's death. In the first sentence the ἀπειρία is probably not Phormio's but the speaker's and ἀδυνάτως ἔχει refers simply to Phormio's health. The first note on § 4 (p. 324, n. a) ignores the evidence of XLV 25-31, which makes it certain that the challenge was to Apollodorus, to have the original lease unsealed if he questioned the copy submitted. In § 8 (p. 327) εἰ δεῖσται means 'inasmuch as it would be necessary', not 'if it should be necessary'. In § 14 Murray does not seem to have perceived the identity

(noticed by Schaefer) between the suit there mentioned and the transactions about which it said in § 32 that 'evidence has been submitted': mathematical difficulties vanish if τοῖς τούτου παιδίοις at the end of § 14 is taken not with ἔδωκεν but with ἐγκαλέσας. On p. 333, n. d, it should be observed that the fact that a temple of Athena was on the Acropolis does not prove that it was the

Parthenon. Finally, it is misleading to the modern reader to speak in note a on § 5 of the third speech against Aphobus of 'the high value attributed by the Greeks to evidence extracted from a slave by torture' without adding that none of the many challenges in extant speeches in fact led to any slave being tortured.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

DEMOSTHENES.

P. CLOCHÉ: *Démosthènes et la fin de la démocratie athénienne*. Pp. 334. Paris: Payot, 1937. Paper, 36 fr.

PROFESSOR Cloché has followed up his other works on fourth-century Athens with an account of the political career and achievement of Demosthenes. He has given us a clear and candid exposition, unravelling the knotty points with all his usual patience and orderliness, and scrupulously avoiding all rhetorical aids to truth. His portrait of Demosthenes is rendered in somewhat matt colours, but the great orator would have no difficulty in recognizing himself in it.

Cloché frankly admits the undeniable blemishes in Demosthenes' political record, his tendency to rancour and his occasional lapses into sophistry: he points out, for instance, that Demosthenes' speech *De Falsa Legatione* is less straightforward and convincing than Aeschines' rejoinder to it. He also shows up the narrowness of Demosthenes' outlook, his bland assumption that Greeks were better than barbarians and democrats superior to oligarchs, and his apparent indifference to the social problems of his day. On the other hand he effectively rebuts the charge of venality which critics of Demosthenes still prefer; and he rightly insists that the orator's crusade against Philip was not a mere heroic gesture, but the work of a practical man who grappled closely with questions of ways and means, and understood the difficult art of 'reculer pour mieux sauter'.

Two main problems of Demosthenic policy invite a fuller discussion than they have received in this book. (1) After 346 B.C. Demosthenes, who by now realized that the only way of

defeating Philip was by an extensive coalition of major Greek states, damped down anti-Macedonian agitation at Athens while he built up a wide patriot front. Yet before this front had been established he renewed his overt opposition to Philip; in 341 (the year of the *De Chersoneso* and the *Third Philippic*) he burnt his boats, and Chaeronea was the upshot. (Demosthenes' policy at this stage was indeed more provocative than Cloché would admit. Cloché passes lightly over the raids of the Athenian general Diopithes on Macedonian territory, while he roundly condemns Philip's retaliatory capture of Athenian merchantmen, though in this case the king merely exercised recognized rights of σύλλα.) Can this reversal of policy on Demosthenes' part be sufficiently explained by his growing concern about Philip's apparent menace to the Black Sea passage and the corn-trade route?

(2) How far did Demosthenes gauge Philip's attitude to the Greeks correctly? The view that Philip intended the Greeks to be his partners rather than his subjects has been ably argued by Momigliano, and has recently been reaffirmed by Gomme (*Essays*, no. IX). It receives strong prima-facie support from the seemingly liberal settlement which Philip imposed upon the Greeks after Chaeronea. Cloché discounts this settlement by denying all initiative to the newly constituted κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων. But, in the absence of direct evidence on this point, our safest guide is the revised κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων of 302 B.C., and in this constitution Demetrius Poliorcetes expressly accorded the right of initiative to the Greek cities.

Cloch  also points to the arbitrary character of Macedonian rule, as described in the speech *περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον συνθηκῶν*. But this oration is not good evidence against Philip.

We may regret that Cloch  did not allow himself more elbow-room on these two crucial questions. By way of compensation, he might have dealt more summarily with the *De Corona* (which is of slight political importance), and with the affair of Harpalus, on

which he enters a judicious but non-committal verdict.

But Cloch 's book, taken as a whole, is an excellent introduction to the study of Demosthenes as a statesman. It is eminently fair and well balanced, and its argument is so lucid that if readers disagree with it they will know exactly at what point they part with the author.

M. CARY.

University of London.

OIKEIOSIS.

F. DIRLMEIER: *Die Oikeiosis-Lehre Theophrasts*. (Philologus, Supplementband XXX, Heft 1.) Pp. 100. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1937. Paper, M. 5.80 (bound, 7.30).

PROFESSOR JAEGER having traced the main lines of Aristotle's mental development, it is in accordance with Distributive Justice that his followers should do the same for the following generation of Peripatetics. Mr. Walzer has already successfully searched the *Magna Moralia* for signs of the state of mind prevailing at that time; Mr. Dirlmeier has here performed the double task of sifting the evidence for the ethical theory of Theophrastus and showing it up against the historical background. Theophrastus was, even more definitely than the ageing Aristotle, a worker in the field of natural science. The thesis here maintained is that it was he who first included nature in the definition of the good life. It is necessary to guard against a misunderstanding. To live *κατὰ φύσιν* was an old phrase, and in an idealistic and teleological sense of *φύσις* it represents what both Plato and Aristotle had maintained. But Theophrastus took *φύσις* in a narrower sense, similar to that in which Aristotle speaks of *φυσικὴ ἀρετή*; and he founded his theory on observation of the primary impulses of animals and young children. Stoicism is thus in debt to him for some of its leading ideas.

This is the essential thesis; but a mass of detailed research is included, and the essay contributes very fully to the whole history of ethics between Plato and Cicero. Now it should, I

think, be judged from two points of view. (1) Does the evidence, which is all indirect, really indicate that Theophrastus maintained what is here ascribed to him? (2) If so, is it right to conclude that his ethical thinking was permeated by the methods of empirical science, and that the Stoic doctrine was worked out in conscious reference to him? To the first question I should answer Yes; to the second, Not proven.

First, under the heading *τὰ κατὰ φύσιν*, the author examines the classification of goods from Plato onwards. It is argued that whereas Aristotle used such an expression as *ἐπιθυμεῖν κατὰ τὴν φύσιν*, Theophrastus said *ὀρέγεσθαι τῶν κατὰ φύσιν*, and included the 'natural goods' in his actual definition of happiness. The evidence for this is a quotation by Arius Didymus. Under a second main heading, *οἰκειώσις*, Mr. Dirlmeier considers (1) a résumé of Peripatetic ethics again provided by Didymus, and (2) Cicero's *de Fimibus*, Books IV and V. The treatment of Cicero is very valuable, and it is here that the real strength of the argument lies. Cicero must have had first-hand knowledge of Theophrastus, and certain passages practically identify him as the main source. Now the 'end for man' is defined in Book IV as 'earum rerum quae sint secundum naturam, quam plurima et quam maxima adipisci.' In its establishment the observation of new-born animals and children plays an important part.

The ascription of the views in question to Theophrastus on this evidence

seems to be quite sound. But in depicting the philosophical background the author seems to me to take rather more for granted. It may be true that Theophrastus, Polemon and the Stoics all founded their ethics upon an interpretation of natural impulses. Indeed conclusive evidence is here given that they did so. But it may be that the cause was something in the atmosphere of the time, and not direct influence of one on the others. In answer to this Mr. Dirlmeier might emphasize that Theophrastus had *priority* in time. He mentions that Chrysippus, a generation later, is the first Stoic known to have founded his ethics on natural impulses. But this is not equivalent to the statement that he is known to have been the first to do so. Moreover the

mere word 'nature' ought not too readily to be linked with an empirical mode of thought. Scientific interests may account for its prominence in Theophrastus. Other philosophers, disillusioned about political life, may have stressed the word in its old sophistic sense of nature in opposition to convention. Unless something like this were true, why should the Stoics energetically take up the notion from Theophrastus? If he was immersed in observational science, they were not.

It must again be stressed that the essay is full of detailed research of a very profitable kind. It could easily be expanded into a book twice its length.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

LUCRETIANA.

K. BÜCHNER: *Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez.* Pp. 126. (Hermes, Einzelschriften, 1.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1936. Paper, M. 10.

A. P. SINKER: *Introduction to Lucretius.* Pp. xxx + 139. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

BÜCHNER'S essay is interesting and to my mind important. It is a study of the verse-structure of the *De Rerum Natura* in relation to the sentence and more particularly to the thought of Lucretius. The arguments are clearly stated and the conclusions, if accepted, throw light on several much-discussed problems.

The first chapter deals in the wider sense with the influence of thought on structure. We are apt to expect from Lucretius a strict logical sequence, which we do not always find. In many places Lucretius is dominated by a thought remaining in his mind, to which he refers back over a long intervening period (e.g. ii 661 *itaque* goes back to 599), or in anticipation by an idea which he has not yet made explicit (e.g. ii 251-5 refers to the conception of free-will, not yet mentioned). Büchner's inferences are that some passages bracketed by editors as interrupting the sense may be retained, that lacunae have been assumed unnecessarily, and

that obscure passages may be explained. Many passages are thus submitted to close analysis; the results are nearly always convincing. I do not however think that Büchner has succeeded in explaining the very difficult *uti memoro* in ii 112, and the still more difficult triple reference in ii 478 ff. (479 *ex hoc apta*, 481 *rursum*, 499 *supra quod iam docui*), to which he only refers in a footnote (p. 6, n. 2), cannot, I think, be explained except on the supposition of a lacuna.

Chapters ii and iii are concerned with smaller stylistic questions, the most important of which is that of 'enjambement', the overlap of the sentence from one line to the next. Büchner examines in detail the various kinds of 'enjambement'—substantive and adjective, verb and object, etc.—and gives statistics of their occurrence in the six books (incidentally he makes no mention of Lucretius' very characteristic habit of repeating a word at the beginning of the next line). On the ground of the more frequent occurrence of 'enjambement' he infers that Books iii, iv and vi were written later than i, ii and v. Lucretius' style was developing and he was using 'enjambement' for a conscious artistic purpose, as it is used by Virgil, whom Büchner for comparison

submits to analysis. Similarly the 'prooemia' contain more 'enjambement' than the argumentative passages. This may be due in part to their subject-matter, but also to a more developed technique. Here Büchner is on more treacherous ground, for not only does the subjective element enter, as he himself admits, into one's judgment whether any particular 'enjambement' is conscious, but allowances must surely be made for Lucretius' difficulty in writing *Latinis versibus*; on that point Büchner is silent.

The last part of the book is concerned with deductions from the consideration of 'enjambement'. Büchner decides that the poem to Book iv, which occurs also in i 921 ff., was originally written for Book iv, and defends i 50-148, holding however that the praise of Epicurus (62-79) was written after Lucretius had come to feel that each book should contain its eulogy of the master.

In the work as a whole I find little to quarrel with; it is a very suggestive study which opens a new line of ap-

proach to the understanding of the poem.

Mr. Sinker's 'Introduction to Lucretius' is intended to give a synopsis of the general thought of the poet, which may serve 'as a kind of Baedeker to the intricacies of the structure of the poem and of the system of philosophy which it embodies'. For this purpose the passages are well chosen to illustrate the Canonic, Physics and Ethics of Lucretius and they are connected by clear and concise expositions; the notes too give just the amount of help needed. The introduction, which supplies the essential basis of knowledge, is freshly written with suggestive modern parallels and illustrations and has an interesting section on 'L'Anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce', where however I cannot agree that *vis abdita quaedam* in v 1233 is anything more than the hidden working of the atoms. The book might well be used in schools in preference to the single Book which is usually the school-boy's introduction to Lucretius.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

THE INFLUENCE OF HORACE.

Horace: Three Phases of his Influence.

By Paul Frédéric SAINTONGE, Leslie Gale BURGEVIN, Helen GRIFFITH. Pp. vi+120. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1936. Cloth, 4s. 6d.

THESE three lectures were delivered at Mount Holyoke College to commemorate the bimillennium of Horace: they were not intended as an original contribution to learning. The first deals with the influence of Horace on Ronsard and Montaigne. Ronsard was at first dazzled, as Horace had been, by Pindar; but the essence of Pindar's genius is inseparable from his own age and tongue, and he soon realised that he had found in Horace one whose temperament, especially in his love of the country, was more congenial. The valley of the Loire began to assume for him the aspect of the valley of Digentia. M. Saintonge quotes a few poems (too few, perhaps) to illustrate how Ronsard adapted his model. Here

the significant divergences are more interesting than the general similarity. The poem to the spring of Bellerie follows the Bandusia Ode, but when he comes to the second stanza Ronsard follows the taste of modern romanticism and substitutes some lines about singing under the willows, with a reminiscence of another ode (III, 25); and it seems almost irrelevant, not to say irreverent, to mention the iambic brutality of *Parcius iunctas* in the same breath as 'Quand vous serez bien vieille'. Ronsard derived inspiration from Horace, but, as the author rightly insists, he also learnt from him something he needed still more—restraint. Montaigne no less was steeped in Horace. Not only does he quote him freely, but M. Saintonge gives passages where his reflections on himself can be closely paralleled from the Satires and Epistles, and rightly points out that the chief thing Montaigne owed to Horace was just this art of intro-

spection, and with it encouragement to tell others freely about himself.

The second lecture, 'A Little Farm', is slight. The author quotes writers from Wyatt to George Gissing who have expressed a desire, sometimes glancing at Horace, for a peaceful life in the country with a modest competence; in particular, the Tory 'Brothers' of 1710—the Horatian Matthew Prior, presented by Lord Harley, their Maecenas, with the life-lease of Down Hall, and Swift himself angling for similar favours.

The third lecture, on 'The Horatian Strain in Literary Criticism', is sensible and up-to-date. (So many sources are mentioned that one misses the admirable Introduction to Rostagni's *Arte Poetica*.) Miss Griffith finds three main elements in Horace's criticism

that have come down to our day: 'his attitude toward the function of poetry, especially its relation to the state, his belief in the use of models, and his insistence on craftsmanship.' Of these the first is the most interesting, and she lays her finger on the point when she says (p. 95): 'The delightful-instruction theory of poetry as such has fallen into disrepute. We have come to associate it with propaganda and the Sunday-school story rather than with plays like *Oedipus Rex* or *King Lear* or *Le Misanthrope* which are deeply moral and so, of necessity, instructive. . . . Horace never clearly distinguishes between the two.' The lecture closes with some remarks and historical facts about the use of Horace in schools.

L. P. WILKINSON.

King's College, Cambridge.

VERSIONS OF HORACE, CATULLUS AND TIBULLUS.

A. S. WAY: (a) *The Odes of Horace*, a literal translation; (b) *Catullus and Tibullus in English Verse*. Pp. 105, 123. London: Macmillan, 1936. Cloth, 2s. 6d. each.

THE late Dr. Way was surely the most industrious of all translators of the classics, and his work always maintained a high level of scholarship and literary excellence.

These two posthumous volumes are different in aim. The translation of the Odes of Horace is a word-for-word version and in no sense a verse translation designed to compete with those of Conington and Martin; rather it enters the lists against the prose versions of Wickham, Bryce, and Lonsdale and Lee; that its lines are metrical is an accident of the translator's idiosyncrasy, because he found it easier so to translate, and its presentation in lines corresponding to the original is designed to facilitate reference and comparison.

Dr. Way certainly achieved what he set out to do, and his version will be welcomed by all who appreciate a scholarly piece of work and an interesting experiment in versification. One example, the second quatrain of IV, 2, must suffice:

As from a mountain raceth down a river,
That rains above its wonted banks have swollen,
So boils, in song-flood deep past fathoming,
So rushes Pindar.

The translation of Catullus and Tibullus has quite a different character. Dr. Way chose the metres which he considers best suited to the subjects of the poems and has used rhyme throughout. For the longer pieces of Catullus and for the whole of Tibullus he uses a metre which he had employed on many previous occasions—a six-foot anapaestic metre with iambic substitutions and frequent anacrusis; when he translates hexameters his lines rhyme in pairs; for elegiacs he uses alternate rhymes. We must confess that this metre does not seem entirely satisfactory, partly perhaps because it is unfamiliar; it is not always easy to read and sometimes difficult to scan. We take a single example, Tibullus II, 1, 1-4:

Hush, all who are present! We purify orchard
and fields of corn,
As enjoined the rite that was handed down
from our sires of old.
O Vine-god, come, with the sweet grapes hang-
ing adown from thy horn,
And thou with the wheat-ears, Harvest-
queen, thy brows enfold.

The poems of the first half of Catullus are rendered in various metres. Sometimes the original metre is imitated, as in the very successful rhymed version of the famous adaptation of Sappho (LI) which begins:

Blest as the very gods is he, meseemeth—
If I dare say it, even gods excelling—
Who face to face upon thy beauty dreameth
Sitting and dwelling
On thy sweet laughter: all my senses fail me, etc.

Sometimes Dr. Way seems to imitate

the style of Thomas Moore, e.g. in his version of Poem VIII:

O hapless Catullus, refrain you
From foolish regret for the lost,
And what you can never regain you,
Down the wind be its memory tossed.

Space forbids further quotation, but we may say in conclusion that this little book is well worth possessing both by those who can and by those who cannot read the original.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

CUMAEAN GATES.

Cumaean Gates. A Reference of the Sixth Aeneid to Initiation Pattern. By W. F. JACKSON KNIGHT. Pp. xv+190; 15 illustrations. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THIS is not an easy book to review. Mr. Knight has pursued his researches into the folk-lore and magic which lie behind Virgil's story, and has pressed further the study of the maze or labyrinth, begun in *Virgil's Troy*. He starts by examining VI 9-44 and asks why, as commentators have complained, 'the action is delayed' by Aeneas' inspection of the temple of Apollo, on the gates of which Daedalus had engraved the legend of the Minotaur and the Labyrinth. Mr. Knight's answer is to my mind convincing. The purpose of a maze is to admit those only who know the way. It has therefore in primitive times two main uses, one a tactical use for defence, as at Maiden Castle, a view of which forms the frontispiece, the other a ritual use in connection with the dead, where the maze at the entry to the lower world is a path known to the initiate, but baffling to others. This view is well supported from maze-inscriptions on graves and from ritual, and in particular from a striking ritual among the Malekulans of the New Hebrides. The pictured maze then rightly 'delays the action', because it should delay Aeneas in his descent to the realm of the dead.

This main contention is clear and valuable, though it seems hardly necessary to refer Virgil's knowledge of the idea to Jung's 'collective unconscious' (p. 181): Norden has surely shown

that Virgil had much tradition at his disposal, and the comparison of the *Iudus Troiae* in Book V to the Cretan Labyrinth proves that he was aware of the association of the maze-dance with funerary rites.

The difficulty which most readers will feel is that not only is Mr. Knight's subject 'labyrinthine', but his argument is labyrinthine too, and when you start on a clue you never know whether it is going to lead you to the centre or down a *cul de sac*. A great range of anthropological lore is brought to bear, and it is sometimes hard to resist the feeling that it has not been sufficiently sifted and criticized. Mr. Knight is too ready to erect possible parallels into certain proofs. Take two instances from a single page (161). 'The mysteries, the sixth *Aeneid*, and much else besides are, or can become, expressions of a "universal myth" of the soul's journey to perfection. This has been proved'; and in the footnote we find a reference to a study of *The Tempest*, where it is argued that the 'forthrights and meanders' are a ritual maze. Does that really *prove* anything about the *Aeneid*? Next we are told that 'it seemed almost certain' that the 'blind march' at Eleusis was a maze movement, though excavation has revealed no trace of a maze. 'But now the gap is filled' by a maze design at an entrance to a cave in Malekula. There is surely still something of a gap. Or again we learn on p. 115 that on certain Babylonian tablets there are patterns which are taken to represent the intestines of animals for divination; one of

these is inscribed 'ékai tiráni', which is translated 'the palace of the intestines'. Tiráni 'may be compared' with Troia; so the walls of Troy are an intestine pattern. More than this: on p. 139 we have a scene from a Corneto bowl showing Theseus attacking the Minotaur, and on the left is Ariadne, holding the clue thread, the coiled end of which lies on the ground. Not a bit of it; 'it has been thought that the coil really belongs to the anatomy of Ariadne', though it can 'hardly be proved on the evidence which there is at present'.

It is this kind of looseness of thought which makes the non-anthropological reader distrustful, and he finds it hard to pick out the arguments of value. Similarly the classical reader has his doubts. On p. 78 Mr. Knight is arguing, and no doubt rightly, that the purpose of the maze is to exclude, but

he has no right to adduce in support Virgil's use of the word *impediunt* in his description of the *ludus Troiae*. Virgil's phrase (V. 584) is *alternosque orbibus orbes impediunt*, which means that the riders 'cut one circle with another'—it has nothing whatever to do with exclusion. On the next page the word 'mystery' is pressed into the service, because it 'comes from a word which means "shut", μύω'; but it does not, it means 'to shut the eyes or mouth'.

No one can doubt Mr. Knight's anthropological learning, nor his ingenuity, but he has tried to do too much and to subsume too many conceptions under one head. Nevertheless it is a stimulating book, it collects a great deal of material, and I have no doubt that it has explained that mysterious incident at the beginning of *Aeneid* VI.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

THE SOURCES OF SILIUS.

John NICOL: *The Historical and Geographical Sources used by Silius Italicus*. Pp. 179. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THE longer part of this work discusses the historical, and the shorter the geographical sources of Silius' epic. As he wrote, according to Pliny, *carmina maiore cura quam ingenio*, one would naturally expect that sources could be found for most of his material. The method of approach is by a fourfold classification of the subject-matter, historical, geographical and ethnological, imitations of previous poets, and episodes and digressions which do not come under any of the first three classes. The view of Heynacher that Livy was not the chief source is conclusively refuted, but on the other hand Silius is not to be regarded as a mere free versifier of Livy. The influence of Livy would seem to be least in the accounts of Scipio's campaigns in Spain and of the capture of Syracuse by Marcellus. There are differences of chronology, especially about Spain, and the Fabian tradition is more prominent in Silius, whose praise of Scipio and Marcellus is poetic rather than historical.

Other differences from Livy occur in Silius' accounts of the siege of Saguntum, the character of Hasdrubal, the crossing of the Alps (where agreement with Livy is only partial), the prodigies at Trasimene, the stations of the Carthaginian generals at Cannae, the wind *Voltumnus* in that battle, and the *ferrea manus* (xiv. 320). In many of these examples the poet agrees with Appian or Zonaras, but shows no use of Coelius Antipater or Polybius. The Punic name *Aris* in Livy xxvi. 49. 5 and Silius xv. 232 leads the writer to claim the annalist Valerius as the main additional source used by Silius. He seems to have made out a strong case, and it may be noted that the same conclusion was reached by Klotz in *Rhein. Mus.* 82 (1933), pp. 1-34, in an article which was unknown to Nicol.

The geographical sources used by Silius were independent of the historical. The new information to be derived from him concerns details, which in the case of African peoples, for example, are exceedingly interesting. The writer rejects the inevitable Timaeus and Posidonius, while also proving that Trogus, Mela and Pliny were not

sources. Resemblances to Trogus suggest a common source in Varro, to whom he would add other authors unnamed. Had he known Rehm's article, *Philologus* Supplbd. xxiv. 2. pp. 97-106, where Silius' account of Italy is considered in the light of Virgil's, he might have made a more detailed examination of this problem.

But this thorough study of the

materials will help historians in determining the importance of Silius for the historical tradition independent of Livy. The reason for the apparently haphazard combination of sources by the poet still remains unknown to us. I have noted a dozen minor misprints, and there is a major dislocation on p. 57.

D. J. CAMPBELL.

University of Edinburgh.

A LETTER OF SALLUST TO CAESAR.

G. CARLSSON: *Eine Denkschrift an Caesar über den Staat*. Pp. 131. (Skifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund, 19.) Lund: Gleerup, 1936. Paper, kr. 6.

THE main object of this treatise is to show that the earlier of the two Sallustian Letters to Caesar was not written in 49 (the conventional date), nor in 50 (as recently suggested by Gelzer and Seel), but in 51: in other words, it was composed soon after the *rapprochement* between Pompey and the 'Die-hard' nobles in 52, when civil war was not yet impending, and Caesar still had some prospect of returning to Rome quietly and resuming his work as a political reformer by constitutional methods.

Among the many attractive arguments with which the author supports his new dating, the most important relates to the *locus desperatus* in ch. 4 § 1, 'a M. Catone et L. Domitio quadraginta senatores sicuti hostiae mactati sunt'. This he refers to the judicial 'murders' (i.e. sentences of exile) after the Clodius riots of 52. No such number of senators is known to have been victimized at that time; but Carlsson suggests that Sallust may have

exaggerated, or that the numeral may have been miscopied. If this argument is accepted, the only serious reason for doubting whether Sallust was the author of the Letter will also have been disposed of. Carlsson further removes the chief prop for the conventional dating of the Letter, the allusion to the 'pedes fugaces' of L. Domitius (ch. 9 § 2), by pointing out that this need not refer to Domitius' attempted flight from Corfinium in 49, but may be an allusion to his actual flight from the Forum in the election riots of 55.

It may be added that, if Sallust wrote in 51, his plan for reforming the Comitia Centuriata (ch. 8) acquires a new significance. As Carlsson points out, this scheme was first put forward in 63 by Ser. Sulpicius Rufus. But in 51 Rufus was consul, and it seems hardly too rash to assume that he used this occasion to bring the reform again into public notice.

Carlsson's thesis will no doubt be subjected to a severe scrutiny. But in the meantime we may congratulate him on an elegant and *prima facie* cogent piece of reasoning.

M. CARY.

University of London.

A NEW EDITION OF THE GERMANIA.

Die Germania des Tacitus, erläutert von R. MUCH. (Germanische Bibliothek, I. Abteil, V. Reihe, Bd. 3.) Pp. xiv + 464; 1 map, 26 illustrations. Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. Paper, RM. 12 (cloth, 14).

RUDOLF MUCH has long been held in honour by all who have an interest in ancient Germany. His contributions to the subject are distinguished by a

mastery of Germanic philology and antiquities coupled with a sober judgment which is often sadly to seek. The same qualities are to be found in this detailed commentary on the *Germania*, which he lived to pass through the press. After a preface of six and a half pages he plunges in *medias res*. Each chapter is headed by the text, which is expounded line by

line. At the end are twenty-six illustrations, three indexes, and a map not specially prepared for this volume.

The commentary is based on the lectures which the author was wont to deliver as Professor of Germanic Antiquities in Vienna. That is a feature which it has in common with the elaborate commentary contained in the fourth volume of Müllenhoff's *Deutsche Altertumskunde*, first published in 1900, a work which despite its great learning even the non-specialist could feel to be unsatisfactory in several respects, and which Much pronounces to have been inadequate even at the date of its publication and not least in its author's own special field. Another common feature is that both editors were primarily Germanists; and in view of recent advance in knowledge a new commentary written from this side was much wanted. Much's exposition, closely reasoned throughout without being polemical, not only reflects this increase of knowledge but is more compact and much more readable than his predecessor's and takes account of the results of archaeological research, to which is due a large part of the advance that has been made in the criticism of Tacitus' monograph. It is the most interesting and the most helpful commentary that has appeared.

The scale of the book may be gauged from the fact that Tacitus' first sentence has nearly twelve closely printed pages devoted to it, while in the next the mention of *Rhenus* and *Danuvius* leads to an etymological explanation of the names which takes up more than two pages. Yet there are some gaps: there is, for instance, no discussion of the nature of the principate in German states, a question that has not been settled and perhaps never will be. A commentary so extensive cannot be examined in detail within the limits of this review. Not all the views expressed are convincing, nor are all the old problems definitely solved, though the ground is usually cleared. The text is in general conservative, sometimes unduly so. Thus *quem barditum vocant* (ch. 3) is retained although the admirable discussion shows that there is no tolerable explanation of *barditus* and

leads plainly to the adoption of the variant *bar(r)itum*. In ch. 4 *quamquam* (*in tanto hominum numero*) is preferred to *tamquam* on the ground that the admission of exceptions 'would rob of all value the appeal to uniformity of physical type as a proof of racial purity'; but Tacitus could neither know nor venture to assert that there were no exceptions, and *quamquam* is not only otiose but would not have been corrupted or emended to *tamquam*. When Tacitus describes Germany as *frugiferarum arborum impatiens* (ch. 5) and five chapters later speaks of *virga frugiferae arbori decisa*, he certainly cannot be acquitted of careless writing, but he would have been equally careless had he written *patiens* (which Much adopts) without such a qualification as he makes in *Agr. 12, praeter oleam vitemque*, etc. This is not the only example of somewhat negligent composition: in the much-discussed passage *ceteris robustioribus*, etc. (ch. 13), *comitibus* has to be supplied from the following clause, which is bad style. The phrase which immediately precedes, *principis dignationem*, will long continue to be disputed. Much takes it (like many others) to mean 'the esteem of a prince', but he (like them) fails to notice that *ceteris* cannot be right when no member of the class has been previously mentioned. In one place (ch. 16) he prints an emendation of his own, *ne pati quidem inter se munitas* (for *iunctas*) *sedes*, considering that there is an irreconcilable contradiction between the manuscript text and the following statement that every German villager keeps a free space round his dwelling, whether as a precaution against fire or owing to want of skill in building; for whether we take *paci* in its full or in its weakened sense, 'one and the same thing cannot be explained as due to a prohibition or a disinclination and also to unskillfulness in building.' He also takes exception to the repetition of the statement that the Germans keep their houses free of each other. This seems hypercritical. *Ne pati quidem* need only mean that they do not let their houses touch each other, which is no more than a statement of fact, and even so concise a writer as Tacitus may be allowed to

develop the idea of 'no contiguous dwellings' when he goes on to describe the native villages. Anyhow *munitas* will not do: other considerations apart, Tacitus would not have written *patis inter se* for *apud se*, nor indeed would he have used any prepositional phrase at all.

Other examples of unconvincing textual criticism might be quoted. But these are matters pertaining to the sphere of classical scholarship, in which Much would not have claimed to be an expert. When he deals with the matter of the treatise, his exposition bears the

stamp of acute and intensive thought, expert knowledge, and sound common-sense. It is refreshing to read his treatment of the passage about the origin of the generic name *Germani*, after one has perused the reams that have been written on it, or his helpful discussion of the most disputed passage of the *Germania*, the chapter on agriculture. But the student will discover for himself the many merits of this most welcome volume.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Oxford.

A VERSION OF TACITUS, ANNALS IV-XVI.

Tacitus: The *Annals*, Books IV-XVI. With an English translation by John JACKSON. In two volumes (III, IV). Pp. vii + 422, 1 map; pp. 423, map repeated. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather 12s. 6d.) each.

THESE two volumes complete Mr. Jackson's translation of the *Annals*. In a brief preface he acknowledges his debt to the late Dr. Page, who helped him 'in the disheartening task of revising a translation made at an age which has begun to look like boyhood and only touched again after years of estrangement from the author and the period.' The work itself hardly shows signs of youthful immaturity. The translation of Books I-III was noticed in C.R. XLVI. p. 39, where it was said that it may fairly be called the best English version. These words are equally applicable to the continuation of the work. Accurate interpretation, terse and felicitous diction—these are the qualities we desiderate in a translation of Tacitus, and here we have them combined. Occasionally, no doubt, we come across a rendering which falls short of the ideal. An instance may be found in the account of Seneca's interview with Nero (XIV, 53), where the former says: 'Often I put the question to myself, "Is it I, born in the station of a simple knight and a provincial, who am numbered with the magnates of the realm? *Inter nobiles et longa decora praeferentes novitas mea enituit?*"'

The rendering 'Among these nobles, wearing their long-descended glories, has my novel name swum into ken?' scarcely shows the dexterity we have become accustomed to look for. But in general the neatness and naturalness of Mr. Jackson's style make his version pleasant to read, and his skill will be appreciated both by those who have tried their hand at putting Tacitus into nervous English and by the cultured readers for whom the Loeb series is primarily intended.

Mr. Jackson admits a few emendations of his own. They appear to be seven, and they are worth collecting, as they may easily escape notice and some of them are convincing, while others are probable.

XI, 30 *id enim paclici nomen* (*idem* Med., *id* vulg.). The phrase occurs in XVI, 30, and the confusion of *idem* and *id enim* in Liv. I, 17, 9.

XII, 68 *dum quae res ferret firmando Neronis imperio componuntur* (*quae reforent* Med.).

XIV, 22 *fontem aquae* <a Q.> *Marcio ad urbem deductae* (*aquae margio* Med., *aquae Marciae* Puteolanus). For the haplography he compares IV, 61 *et quae for et Q.*

XIV, 29 *neque Aulus* <Didius> *legatus* (A. Didius Lipsius) for the MS. *hauitus*, which he considers 'is clearly a corruption of the praenomen written in full.'

XIV, 60 *canere tibiis perdoctus* (*per tybias doctus* Med., *tibiis doctus* vulg.).

XV, 43 *iam aqua . . . quo largior . . . in publicum fluere*, custodes <adessent>, where Madvig supplied *essent*. (For *adessent* cp. XV, 46 *qui custos adesset*.)

XVI, 33 . . . *in exilium actus, aequitatis deum erga bona malaque documento* (cp.

XV, 27) for the MS. *aequitate . . . documenta*, which is hardly sound though usually accepted.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Oxford.

A COMMENTARY ON PLINY'S NATURAL HISTORY.

C. Plini Secundi *Naturalis Historiae Liber Secundus*. By Donald J. CAMPBELL. Pp. 108. Aberdeen: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 5s.

THE title-page might be thought to promise a text, but Mr. Campbell has confined textual matters to a critical appendix, in which he makes use of his own work on the manuscripts and in particular on the ninth-century Cheltenham MS. to which he drew attention in *A.J.P.* 57. 113. He departs from the Teubner text of Mayhoff in some forty places: most of the changes are slight and are not discussed in the commentary. Of the three new readings which he suggests, two are attractive: 190 *propriate* for *pro nunciate* (though the note in which he explains his conjecture is very obscurely worded), and 201 *eidem Cerceis*. The third, 235 <in> *materia*, is unnecessary: the use of *sufficere* with an ablative is not unnatural. 'codd. legunt' (p. 96) is an original turn of phrase.

His commentary is mainly concerned with the cosmological subject-matter of the book and its sources, with which I am not competent to deal, and the notes on other matters are few. This restriction is no doubt due to the abridgement to which the preface refers; but there is much that is interesting in Book II, and much that calls for explanation, besides cosmology, and it is a pity that this has been excluded. The *in* of the MSS. which he restores in 120 (*in violentia inferior*) and the *haec* which he restores for *aut* in 139 both deserve some annotation. In 174 he takes *tumultuamur* as transitive although no instance of that use can be cited.

A careful examination of Pliny's vocabulary and style would have been very useful to Latinists, but Mr. Campbell's account of these things in his

Introduction is neither as careful nor as useful as one could have wished. *Dilatare* appears in his list of 'frequentative' verbs. His 'words found in earlier poetry but not in prose until Pliny' include *laborare* 'in meaning "be eclipsed"', which is used by Cicero (*T.D.* 1. 92). Of his 'meanings new to prose', 'cuncta=omnia' and the causal use of *si quidem* are already in Cicero and Caesar. Among the genitives grouped under the heading 'partitive or quasi-partitive' are *cetera eiusdem naturae* and *Neronis principis supremis*. *Quaeque trans maria petimus* is made into an instance of 'trans. of terminus a quo' and translated 'from across the seas'. *Ov. Tr.* 5. 8. 23 *peccavi citra scelus* is said to be an instance in which 'the meaning (of *citra*) is indistinguishable from *sine*'. *Utque nunc sublimis in delectu positus videtur hic vertex* (2. 179) is an instance of 'the device of omitting pronouns belonging to the third person': the insertion of such a pronoun would be a solecism. *Natos alit semelque editos* (2. 154) somehow illustrates 'the concise Greek use of adverbs as attributive adjectives'; and *diadumenus*, *ectypus* and *strutho-camelus* are thought to exemplify 'the influence of Greek on the vocabulary of ordinary life'. Seneca is alleged to have said that 'the ending -bilis is not in conformity with the genius of the Latin language': reference to *Ep.* 117. 5 shows that he said nothing so manifestly untrue. The genitive with *tenuis* 'seems to be due to Greek μέγρι': not to many nowadays.

These errors and inaccuracies seem to betray a lack of feeling for language and for Latin idiom which is regrettable in one who seeks to analyse the style of a difficult Latin author. The same insensitiveness is shown in the general arrangement of the material.

Mr. Campbell says that 'the first part' of his Introduction 'attempts to show the sources from which Pliny drew his vocabulary, especially his borrowing from poetry and popular speech. Thereafter some analysis is given of the features which produce his peculiar literary style'. But the inquiry into sources is quite unsystematically pursued. *Adde quod* is dismissed as belonging to the 'constantly recurring type of phrases which enlivens Seneca's style and which was common in colloquial Latin': it would have been more helpful to point to the frequency of *adde quod* in the declamations and its appearance in the rhetorical poets. 'Per omnia similis, scabunt aures are not expressions of a stylistic purist', says Mr. Campbell, without further comment; but the two phrases represent two entirely different and unrelated kinds of impurity. And in the 'analysis' features which may be regarded as peculiar to, or characteristic of, Pliny or his age are jumbled up with such pieces of common Latinity as *semel*, 'once for all', *cognitum habeo*, *paucis ante annis*, a 'of place from which

something comes' and (as Mr. Campbell oddly puts it) 'demum = only'. He cites two cases of *haud scio an* but makes no comment on the fact that Pliny's use of the phrase is not that which is the commoner in the Silver Age.

The occasional strictures on Pliny's style come strangely from one who writes English as Mr. Campbell does and says such things as 'Quin used of an assertion', 'we have got totum used here substantivally', 'The New Pythagoreans were sun worshippers from the Christian era', 'Alike or different forms of the same verb', 'Inscriptions record something as done, ex visu or somnio admonitus'.

The only serious misprints which I have noticed are on p. 30 viii. 156 for viii. 15. 6, and on p. 49 ii. 10 for ii. 16. The new author Eumenes on p. 77 looks more like a mis-expansion of the 'Eum.' of Lewis and Short. In a book written in Edinburgh and printed in Aberdeen St. Andrews ought to have been safe from an apostrophe.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

THE INSTITUTIONES OF CASSIODORUS.

Cassiodori Senatoris *Institutiones*.

Edited from the Manuscripts by R.

A. B. MYNORS. Pp. lvi + 193. Oxford:

Clarendon Press, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS is an edition that has long been badly wanted. Schanz, in 1914, wrote: 'Hier fehlt es noch an eingehenden, abschliessenden Studien; ein Resultat ist aber gewonnen, dass die *res humanae* in zwei Recensionen, einer längeren und einer kürzeren vorliegen. . . . Eine kritische Ausgabe ist dringende Notwendigkeit'. Now we have it: 'Two hundred and fifty years have elapsed since the last edition of the *Institutiones*, and this is the first attempt to produce a critical text based on the manuscript tradition as a whole'. But the problem was more complicated than Schanz or others had thought: 'When Cassiodorus . . . set himself to compile for the monks of his foundation at Vivarium an Introduction to their studies, he divided his work into two books: one dealt with

their monastic life, the second contained a compendium of such secular knowledge as was indispensable to the study of Holy Writ. . . . manuscripts in which both books are found together are extremely rare. . . . *Book I* is preserved . . . in a number of copies . . ., which fall into well-marked groups; and one particular form of the text was widespread in the XIIth century and later. *Book II* had a more complicated history, and three versions survive, differing greatly in length. The shortest, generally recognized as authentic, is given by those copies which preserve Books I and II together. . . . At an early date, in order to increase its value as a handbook of secular learning, this text was shorn of irrelevancies and expanded with fresh materials . . .; and in numerous copies of the IXth and Xth centuries we have two successive stages of this interpolated version, whose exact relation to the authentic text is a question of some difficulty. The authentic text is here for the first time

printed as the standard, and variants of the interpolated version are added at the foot of the page'.

Mr. Mynors has diligently and handsomely carried out his undertaking. He has examined all the MSS, with the exception of a few of the late interpolated copies, written in the Middle Ages, in the originals or by photographs, and has constructed *stemma codicum* which seem unassailable.

There are no notes on the matter: but the foundation is now laid for a commentary, which would be of the highest interest, on 'an author who sits on the threshold between two Ages, and looks before and after'. The commentator will find that Mr. Mynors has given him much help in the critical annotation, which contains many references to the Greek and Latin sources of Cassiodorus's knowledge: and if it be remembered that he was a member of a rich and noble family, who turned monk only after some forty years in public life, in the course of which he had attained the highest offices of state, it will be realised that he was acquainted with all the secular literature current in his time: and Mr.

Mynors has added an *Index Auctorum*, which is of great assistance in showing what books he quoted, many or most of which were to be found in the library at Vivarium. Perhaps his range of reading is a little disappointing to us: but we must remember that he was writing for the Brethren, and would avoid the citation of immoral or flippant writers, even if he knew their works when he was in the world. Thus we have a good many references to Cicero and a fair number to Virgil: half-a-dozen to Varro: three to Terence (none to Plautus): and one each to Livy and Columella; SS. Augustine and Jerome were his constantly quoted guides, Boethius coming third.

Our best thanks are due to Mr. Mynors for a work which has cost him much time and pains: it only remains to say that they have been well rewarded, and that he has established not only a text, but *the* text which must be the foundation of all future study of his author, and so of the state of letters and learning in the Roman world in the middle of the VIth century A.D.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

A HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE.

ERNST BICKEL: *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Pp. xii + 587. (Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, 8.) Heidelberg: Winter, 1937. Paper, RM. 26 (bound, 29.50).

THIS solid study of Roman literature under different aspects from its origins to its transformation in the hands of Christian apologists is carried out in three main divisions. The first (pp. 1-92), nearly a sixth of the book, is introductory, on general subjects such as the transmission of MSS., ancient philological inquiry, the artistic taste of the Romans and their debt to Greece. The second division (pp. 93-314) deals in eleven chapters with the periods of Roman literature and of the Latin language. It covers the 'Saturnian' centuries, the archaic period, the Gracchan period, the Sullan epoch, the *neoterici* in poetry and classicism in prose, the Augustan age, the rhetorical 'Silver' literature, Antonine archaism, deca-

dence in the third century A.D. with the emergence of a Christian literature, the late blossoming of the fourth century, the senility of Roman literature and the Latin spirit in northern Europe. The third division (pp. 315-565), the longest, though not quite equal to half of the whole, is devoted to separate departments of literature and to authors' lives. Its nine chapters are occupied with religious writings, juristic works, oratory, history, philosophy and science, narrative and didactic poetry, drama, then satire alongside of the novel and fable, and, finally, elegy with epigram, idyll and lyric. The work thus combines the chronological method of the second division with a survey of *genres* in the third, so that there must inevitably be some repetition as well as cross-references to enable a reader to collect the *disiecti membra scriptoris*. One is reminded of the Dewey system of library classification.

There is a large amount of learned

and instructive material in the work. It will appeal most to German students; for the author, while recording in brief bibliographical notes a considerable number of editions by British scholars, is not concerned with indicating what writers outside Germany have done in his subject. Thus, to give one out of many similar instances, no works or views of British scholars on the 'Messianic' eclogue are mentioned. References to ancient and modern authorities are bracketed in the text, or inserted in special paragraphs: there are therefore no footnotes, nor, apart from these references (the modern ones being mostly to German books or articles), is there a bibliography. Usually, with a Latin quotation or phrase a German translation is given: Greek is printed in transliterated form. Index I is for Latin authors and texts: index II for subject-matter and Greek authors. One sees, therefore, why 'Märchen' is in the latter, but not why 'Rätsel' is in the former. Words like 'Drama' or 'Palliata' are hidden under 'Literaturgeist'.

Professor Bickel throughout takes a judicious view of Roman originality: he is at pains to emphasize periods and genres in which Italian 'Spontaneität' emerges. Of the vigorous archaic Latin he gives a particularly good characterization, which serves to explain its attraction for cultured Romans in more than one later age. There is a careful study of the relation of *fabula palliata* to the New Comedy of Greece and of the features which mark its independent treatment of borrowed material. The varied opulence of Augustan poetry leads him to the problem of 'classic' and 'romantic'. His case for the 'Romanticism' of Augustan poetry (and especially of elegy), ably advocated, may not in all its implications convince all

readers; but, then, not all would define and illustrate 'Romanticism' alike. Suggestive remarks are made on Sallust, on Ovid's *rococo* art, on Martial, on the reasons for the collapse of ancient culture in the West, and on the extent to which national Roman streams of influence continued to flow in Christian Latin literature. An occasional lighter touch is welcome, as when the quotation regarding stylistic barbarism, 'one must tattoo oneself to be beautiful', is applied to *Africitas*: it might be extended to a modern 'beauty parlour'.

Horace's Epicureanism strikes the present reviewer as overstated to the neglect of the poet's tendency towards a modified Stoicism; and it is curious that 'Stoicismus' does not appear in the Index, while 'Epikuros u. Epikureismus' get eleven entries, including one for Seneca, who, despite genial borrowings of Epicurean mottoes, remained in the other camp. The chronology of Seneca's works is too airily dismissed as 'in grossen Zügen klar'; for there is much doubt regarding the date of many of the treatises. The problems connected with the *Einsiedeln* eclogues are insufficiently recognized on p. 555. The view that Calpurnius Piso wrote them should be reported as Groag's theory, which Skutsch contradicted; and it might be added that Ferrara's work in Italian argues for Calpurnius Siculus as author. On *compendia* (p. 233) Galdi's work should have been noted. If one mentions slips like *individuelle* (227), *Arnolius* (232), *Étruien* (322), *bedeudete* (324), *Sammung* (378), *antobiographische* (419), *Attelane* (459), *Moralphilosophie* (494), it is with the expectation that a second edition will correct them. The book will be found a useful repository to consult.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN ATHENS.

- I. BARKAN: *Capital Punishment in Ancient Athens*. Pp. 1-3, 41-82. Private Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1936. Paper.

THIS forms part only of a larger dissertation. After a brief introductory chap-

ter Mr. Barkan deals successively with stoning, the *barathron*, ἀποτυμπανισμός, and hemlock, the method adopted in each, and the period of its use. He holds that the first was a formal punishment in the heroic age, but never more than lynch-law in Athens of the classi-

cal period; that in the second the condemned man was hurled alive into the pit, which was near the Areopagus and different from the *δρυγμα* of the fourth-century writers (which was in the deme Melite and received only the dead bodies of criminals), this form of punishment ceasing at the end of the fifth century; that hemlock took its place; and that *ἀποτυμπανισμός*, in use in both centuries, was not execution by cudgelling, but, as Keramopoulos contended, the criminal was fastened—not impaled—by neck, arms and legs to wooden boards (*τύμπανα*) and put to death by a tightening of the clamps. The author only briefly touches on the problem what crimes were punishable by the different forms of execution. 'The gradual changes in this machinery of punishment and the tendency on the part of the Athenians to minimize as much as possible the gruesomeness of execution form the topic of this study.'

It is a useful little work; but Mr.

Barkan is not always at home with his evidence. Attic tragedy cannot be used to prove that stoning was a judicial punishment in Homeric times (though it is probably true); a statement by Plutarch about the punishment of Cylon's fellow-conspirators must obviously be used with care; in a discussion of legal forms Duris's story of the treatment of Samian prisoners by Athens (Plut. *Per.* 28) is of no value, and the chaining of Mnesilochus in *Thesmophoriazusae* cannot, without more ado, be used as exact and detailed legal truth. Nor is it correct to say that in *ἀγῶνες τιμητοί* a defendant or a prosecutor might formally change his proposed penalty if he found it not acceptable, on the evidence of Plato, *Apol.* 38 and Dem. liii 18. It is startling to find a deme *Miletus* at Athens (called *Milete* a few lines lower down in a translation from Plutarch).

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

DELPHI, B.C. 191-31.

Georges DAUX: *Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} Siècle*, 191-31 av. J.-C. Pp. iii + 745, 8 figures and 5 plates. Paris: Boccard, 1936. Paper.

THIS valuable and scholarly book deals with Delphi—chronology, history, and internal affairs—between the Aetolian domination and 31 B.C., and its great mass of inscriptions is handled with learning and judgment. Within his limits of dating the author gives a full and complete conspectus of the subject; he omits matters which would range over other periods, principally religion and some subjects arising from the manumission documents. He, happily, prints the text of the chief inscriptions discussed, and his knowledge of unpublished material and the detailed character of his investigation make the book a notable contribution alike to the Delphic Corpus and to the Prosopography of the future. And at last we get a chronological scheme drawn from *all* the extant documents. The author says that there are several hundred inscriptions still unpublished, all manumissions except a 'dust of fragments',

and that he has taken pains ('je me suis efforcé') to become acquainted with them all (small fragments apart) whether in the originals or in copies. In some cases he has had to depend on provisional copies; but at any rate, for this period, the reader now knows where he is with regard to the unpublished material. After discussing all the different helps to dating M. Daux constructs a detailed archon-list, which from 198-7 to 138-7 is complete; he claims that the archons of the first two-thirds of the second century can be accurately dated, and that he has proved that the transition from half-yearly to yearly *bouleutai* is very close to 101-0, which disproves Pomtow's chronology; a long Appendix (III), particularly valuable for the history of Western Locris, gives the known equivalences with other countries. Discussion of his chronology must be left to the few who have thorough knowledge of the documents.

For the rest, Delphi's varying relationship to the Amphictyony is especially well worked out and her affinities with Western Locris rather than with

Phocis are made clear, and many other things deserve notice: among them are the demonstrations that Lacedaemonia never had any claim to an Amphictyonic vote save through the Dorians of the Metropolis, and that the Roman proxeni were *not* traders; discussions of dicast decrees and double nationality; a complete list (among several lists) of Pythaid documents with the attribution of various fragments; the neat disproof of the belief that between 97 and Mithridates there were annual Pythais; the dating of the sack of the temple by the Maedi to 84, *not* 89. It should not be called 'sûr' that Perseus tried to murder Eumenes, for all that is actually known is an *ex parte* accusation; and more might be made of Delphi's embassy to 'Antiochus.' For, of the competing dates, M. Daux shows that the year was 168; that means that the king was Antiochus IV in the year of Pydna, when Rome sent him an ultimatum, and, looking at Rome's punishment of Rhodes and Delos after Pydna,

how did Delphi manage to send an embassy to Rome's enemy and get away with it? The incident throws its light on Rome's policy towards her. The book indicates that by attending to chronology more may be got from the very numerous manumission texts; p. 222 raises a strong presumption that manumission by fictitious sale was an Aetolian invention. Appendix I gives a useful collection of ἀπολύσεις, but over παραμονή itself readers might have been specifically referred to Doura Parchment 10 and the discussion it has evoked, and the long note on p. 57 is not entirely accurate: documents exist in which the owner reserves the right to sell the ex-slave who is in παραμονή. M. Daux's period is not an exciting one, but it is well done, and one interesting subject comes to life—the rather pathetic renaissance after 140, primarily Athenian, when Greece was trying to recover her self-respect.

W. W. TARN.

Muirtown, Inverness.

SATVRNIA TELLVS.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH: *The Foundations of Roman Italy*. Pp. xviii + 413; 12 plates, 8 maps, 148 illustrations in text. London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 25s.

THERE has long been a gap in the bookshelves of all but the specialist in Italian prehistory, which this book bids fair to fill. Nothing of moderate compass gave us all, or a reasonably full outline; of the information, both archaeological and philological, which, if it does not enable us to tell the story of Italy from the earliest times down to the greatness of Rome, at least shows us how little we know of many regions and how comparatively much of a few. Professor Whatmough has undertaken this huge and thorny task, and seems in the process to have done more than commence archaeologist, for he shows on every page an enviable familiarity with all manner of works in that department, besides the minute accuracy in linguistics which we have long since learned to expect from him. As is proper, but not always done, he lets the

two disciplines supplement each other, and so moves in orderly fashion from the north of the peninsula to the south, throwing in the principal islands for good measure (Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, Malta with Gozo and other small islands of the same group, Pantelleria; all in Chapter xvi). The general result, as it certainly was not easy writing, is not easy reading, for it requires close attention; but no dullness or obscurity is due to the author, whatever of those qualities there is being attributable to the intractable material and to Professor Whatmough's honesty. For he will not allow himself to fill gaps and make a continuous and attractive tale by indulging in hypotheses. Legitimate deductions which can be immediately and plausibly made from the facts find their place, briefly stated; but the stately erections of 'if' upon 'perhaps' which flavour the works of some antiquarians with the charm of detective novels, at the cost of sharing their fictitious character, are markedly absent. *Tecum habita et noris quam sit tibi curta*

super
wor
If
ima
gene
mus
stan
heed
auth
temp
them
sure
Abor
mean
(p. 1
not
venie
the s
and
some
381-
Rom
Rom
when
ing t
into
of E
cf. 2
shrev
taste
Sir

Irene
Pre
pla
me
Lo
155
THE
Maw
quali
a goo
has b
quali
occup
every
been
tables
cerem
descr
Atied
worsh
Husc
not w
NO.

supellex might be the motto of the work.

If no mercy is shown to the too imaginative reconstruction, the facile generalization gets short shrift. We must in future limit our use, for instance, of the word 'Umbrian' if we heed the sound sense of p. 194; the author can talk of *terremare* and of *templa* and yet refuse to see either of them everywhere; he is not at all sure (p. 227) that he knows who the Aborigines were or what their name means; he couples them elsewhere (p. 127) with the Ligurians as a people not to be found wherever it is convenient to do so; he will have none of the supposed differences between Sikels and Sikanians (p. 364) till he can get some proof thereof; he gives up (pp. 381-2) any attempt to analyse early Roman religion into pure Roman, non-Roman Italic and so forth. Hence when he speaks positively, as in throwing the whole weight of his authority into the Asianic scale in the discussion of Etruscan origins (pp. 166-7, 211; cf. 232), he is entitled to be heard as a shrewd and cautious witness with no taste for deceiving or being deceived.

Since this is a book not so much to

read through as to come back to time and again for information and suggestions, it is well to set down here a few errors in details which the reviewer seems to have come across. P. 7: language is certainly a distinguishing mark of man, but not the only one; he is also the sole tool-maker among the animals. P. 54: why must the Teutones have been pure Nordic? P. 57: 'fist-hatchets' seems no improvement on 'hand-axes' or 'bouchers'. P. 172: if *ἀκέομαι* is really to be connected with *acus*, *acies*, what becomes of its well-attested rough breathing (see Vollgraff in *Mnem.*, lvii, 210-31)? P. 233, line 14: for 'fire-leaping' read 'fire-walking', the technical term for such a performance as that of the Hirpi Sorani. P. 364: are the 'legends' concerning the native population of Sicily not rather theories of ancient prehistorians? P. 376: *couvade* is too widespread a rite for any theory of ethnological or cultural connection to be founded on it.

I have noted but one misprint of any importance; on p. 385, line 26, for 'titles' read 'tithes'.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

PRE-ROMAN GUBBIO.

Irene ROSENZWEIG: *Ritual and Cults of Pre-Roman Iguvium*. Pp. viii + 152; plan of Gubbio. (Studies and Documents edited by K. and S. Lake, IX.) London: Christophers, 1937. Paper, 15s.

THE due meed of praise for this Bryn Mawr dissertation can hardly go beyond qualified approval. Approval, for it was a good subject well worth doing, and it has been done, on the whole, decently; qualified, for the dissertation itself is occupied chiefly in assembling well-nigh everything, good and bad, that had been said previously about the Iguvine tables, their interpretation, and the ceremonies and liturgy which they describe and prescribe; about the Atiedian brothers, the gods whom they worshipped, and their ritual. What Huschke thought in 1859 was usually not worth reading then, and is certainly

not worth reprinting in this present year of grace. The text and translation of the tables given here (pp. 118-152) is taken verbatim from Buck's *Grammar*. Hence it represents Buck's views of 1904; in the very second line Buck himself would no longer (ed. 2, 1928, p. 370) translate *urnasier* as '**urnariis*', for *-kn-* is preserved in Umbrian. The willingness to quote without comment Buecheler's idle guess that the Oscan *vezkel* (Tab. Agn.) and Umbrian *vestiše* are related as *μαζός* and *μαστός*, nay to quote it—apart from one unhappy slip—in Buecheler's words ('*Vezkel* quem . . . inter deos Cereri iunctos Bovianenses coluerunt' Buecheler, 'Vezkei whom the Bovianenses worshipped in conjunction with Ares' Rosenzweig), not only argues an unfamiliarity with linguistic matters (Osc. *s* = *ts*, but *μαζός* has *ζ* for

-*ā²d*-, *μαστός* has *στ* for -*ā²l*-), but also reveals to the informed reader that Miss Rosenzweig's knowledge of the dialect-records themselves is not quite first-rate or first-hand. Even I was almost deceived for a moment into thinking that a new *vezkei* had risen above the horizon.

So this monograph is more than a full meal. It is a whole market. But markets are a necessity of life, and who goes to buy may pay his penny and take his pick. But he must bring knowledge and the faculty of judgement with him, lest he choose a stale loaf or a rotten apple.

The best chapter is the first (with its accompanying map). This attempted

reconstruction of the topography of Iguvium is perhaps as near as we can come to the truth without (possibly even with) archaeological excavation. It is also original. Miss Rosenzweig should take her courage in both hands and dare to be more independent, and more critical, next time she writes, seldom as it is given to any man, or woman, to say anything that is both new and true. For students of ancient Italic religions her first effort will save time and trouble (with an index it would have saved more); but they will have to be cautious in their use of it.

J. WHATMOUGH.

Harvard University.

AUGUSTUS AND AGRIPPA.

B. M. ALLEN: *Augustus Caesar*. Pp. x+261; frontispiece. London: Macmillan, 1937. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

F. A. WRIGHT: *Marcus Agrippa, Organizer of Victory*. Pp. xi+268; 8 plates. London: Routledge, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d.

A MEMORABLE and alarming anniversary looms heavily upon us. The poet of the Italian nation was paid his due honours seven years ago, and now all Italy will conspire to acclaim the Princeps who was also Dux. Not Italy alone: already a pair of English books is to hand, written in anticipation of the event.

These anniversaries, being mere accidents of our numerical system, may often prove to be tedious or noxious. Not so with Augustus—an English work, readable and reasonably brief, embracing either the story of his life or the period of his Principate has long been sorely needed. There has been nothing since Shuckburgh and Firth. There is another reason. The past must be understood for itself and from itself, not interpreted according to modern ideas and in alien language. None the less the political and social experience of the present generation is a precious advantage—it should provoke suspicion about words, forms and formulae; it should help to reveal the Roman Revolution, the triumph of the

faction of Augustus and the establishment of the Principate as something personal, immediate and tangible.

But it is not easy to write the history of this age. With the cessation of Cicero's correspondence in July, 43 B.C., secondary authorities obtain for a long time. We possess, of course, the *Res Gestae* of Augustus, authentic evidence if ever there was. But it is an official document and should be estimated accordingly. Given the nature of the evidence, the historian hangs insecure between credulity and scepticism, between a dry and rigorous record of ascertained fact and a hazardous imaginative reconstruction. Worst of all, he may alternate in his choice.

Dr. Allen is a distinguished student of more recent periods of history. His *Augustus Caesar* could not fail to show the results of his historical training and standards. It is a very well proportioned and clearly articulated piece of work. The style is unpretentious—and all the more convincing. But in these days a book upon Augustus requires more study and more thought than Dr. Allen has been prepared to expend. As it is a biography, there must be continuous concentration on the person and achievements of Augustus. Still, without loss of unity it might have been possible to show that Augustus did not stand alone, pre-eminent and pre-

dest
of A
part
frien
care
his
alike
vidie
Yet
of h
mars
War
mon
youn
had
Brun
Rep
Sext

Sa
cata
C. O
surv
colle
subj
'E
alleg
with
Hist
refut
Agri
Acha
men
be t
avoi
pow
pat'
the
soldi
servi
no f
that
—an
fact
was
The
Bell
amic
quot
Ju

Kais
Su
H
ga
R

destined. One misses an appreciation of Augustus's position as the leader of a party, of the rôle and the deeds of those friends and helpers without whom his career in revolutionary politics and his primacy in the Roman State are alike unintelligible. For example, Salvienus Rufus is just not mentioned. Yet Salvienus, among the earliest of his friends, was the greatest of his marshals, the author of victory in the War of Perugia. His treason a few months later would have destroyed the young Caesar if war instead of peace had ensued when Antonius came to Brundisium, having in his alliance the Republican navies of Ahenobarbus and Sextus Pompeius.

Salvidienus's career was brief and catastrophic. The other companion of C. Octavius in the early days at Apollonia survived to become the son-in-law and colleague of Augustus. He is the subject of Professor Wright's book.

'Remo cum fratre Quirinus'. Servius alleges that Virgil wrote these words with Augustus and Agrippa in his mind. History, chronology and common sense refute the scholiast's vain ingenuity. Agrippa is the *fidus Achates*. Like Achates, he is always there but seldom mentioned. Agrippa was not meant to be the peer of the Princes: we must avoid magnifying his collegiality in powers into a schematic 'Doppelprinzipat'. He is rather to be regarded as the 'Deputy-Leader of the Party.' As soldier, engineer, administrator, his services were stupendous. 'There is no fun like work'. Such is the motto that Professor Wright prefixes. Rightly—and he later recalls the illuminating fact that Agrippa's favourite proverb was '*concordia parvae res crescunt*'. The context of that remark (Sallust, *Bell. Jug.* 10), with its insistence on *amici*, *officium* and *fides*, deserved quoting.

Justice is at last being done to this

great public servant. In 1933 two doctoral dissertations appeared, one in America and one in Germany. To the former, Professor Wright acknowledges his indebtedness. His own book presents a friendly and attractive picture of the life and work of Agrippa, in a style that is easy, elegant and flowing. The subject gives scope and excuse for digression—perhaps excessive—upon pirates, aqueducts, and provincial organization.

This also is a 'popular' book, and welcome. None the less, even at the risk of appearing peevish, a review must draw attention to the existence of quite a number of disquieting defects. For example, there is a hair-raising (and irrelevant) account of the later Roman frontier in Germany as 'a high wall of earth and stone with a moat in front' (p. 181); and the deodorized translation of Martial's epigram (which contains authentic quotations from Octavian's improper lampoon upon Antonius) calls the lady 'Glycera', not 'Glaphyra' (p. 40). This is grave. The fact that not Cleopatra but a Cappadocian charmer has 'news-value' at the time of the War of Perugia is of some historical importance.

Indeed, both works here under review illustrate some of the dangers of derived scholarship. In his campaign in Croatia (35 B.C.) Octavian besieged a hill-fort called Metulum. The site is unknown. Some people think they know it. Among the identifications proposed by topographers are Möttling (Metlika) and the hill of Viničica near Josipdol. For history it matters little, and nobody is compelled to state an identification—still less to call the places Möttlina and Vinilica. Again, the Croatian river Kulpa appears in one book as the Kalpa, in the other as the Rulpa.

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

VESPASIAN.

Kaiser Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu Suetons Vita Divi Vespasiani. Von H. R. GRAF. Pp. viii + 150. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937. Paper, RM. 9.

UP-TO-DATE commentaries upon the Greek and Roman historians are an urgent need, though less so for Suetonius than for certain other authors. Dr. Graf's study, which has grown out

of a doctoral dissertation 'Suetons Bild des Kaisers Vespasian', might indeed be described as a commentary upon the biography of Vespasian, discussing it in order, but with inequality, as between different topics, of breadth, of depth—and of value. For example, the events concerning the proclamation of Vespasian and the triumph of the Flavian armies, told by Suetonius in not much more than two chapters (5, 1—7, 3), receive thirty pages out of a total of one hundred and ten. Here Dr. Graf has courageously attacked the problem of the different source-derivations and has produced respectable results. On the other hand, chapters 8-11, describing the new emperor's work of repair and reorganization in Rome, Italy and the provinces under the given and Suetonian title 'stabilire et ornare', come off poorly, with eighteen pages only.

For his study of history, the author acknowledges a great debt to Professor Wilhelm Weber, who has guided him 'zu einer tiefgründigen und befriedigenden Betrachtung geschichtlichen Lebens'. He does not appear, however, to have emulated *Der Prophet und sein Gott* or the treatment of the Antonine Emperors in *C.A.H.* XI. 'Erquickung hast du nicht gewonnen', the Master might say. Dr. Graf keeps off the Brocken. It is no place for Vespasian. So far so good—but is the work really thorough and satisfactory as a piece of needed historical research?

Wagner complains to Faust that sources are hard to get at. Quite so: all the more reason for not burying them again. There are nearly six hundred notes at the end of this book, filling up thirty-five pages. Imposing erudition. What does it amount to? There is much unnecessary quotation of modern authorities, often to the obscuring or omission of the real evidence. For example, Vespasian served as a

military tribune 'in Thracia' c. A.D. 28, after the Thracian War of Poppaeus Sabinus. Dr. Graf, while evading precision about Moesia, an important subject, states that detachments of the legions IV Scythica and V Macedonica took part in the war. As authorities, he cites Schiller, Ritterling and the ubiquitous Weber (p. 114, n. 58). It would save trouble to give the simple fact that those two legions were the garrison of Moesia, no more and no less. The rest is psittacism.

The scrappy section on the provinces suffers especially from ill-digested information. There is no integration, no sign of mastery of the original sources here. We are given a list, at second hand and incomplete, of what are described as the colonial foundations of the Flavians (p. 133 f.). There is no indication that some of these 'colonies', like Flaviopolis, were not really colonies at all. Again, there is a list a page long of attested or putative forts of Vespasianic date in Upper Germany (p. 132). Why? On difficult topics like Vespasian's confident words about the imperial succession or his statement about the need for forty thousand million sesterces, one looks in vain for penetrating criticism; and one starts in alarm at seeing Tacitus ranked with Licinius Sura among the marshals of Trajan—'eine Reihe seiner bedeutendsten Offiziere' (p. 78)—this following upon the account of a Parthian War under Vespasian that never happened (see Tacitus, *Hist.* I, 2).

This work will certainly be of use for reference: in details it may sometimes supplement but it cannot supplant the precise, scholarly and excellent commentary of Mr. Braithwaite (Oxford, 1927).

RONALD SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

ANTONINUS PIUS.

W. HÜTTL: *Antoninus Pius*. 2 vols. Pp. 470, v+372. Prag: Calve, 1933-37. Paper, 42s. 6d.

STUDENTS of Roman History seldom linger over the reign of Antoninus Pius. Some are repelled by its lack of rapid

movement, of dramatic episodes, and consequent absence of 'news value'; and the more serious readers are baffled by the scantiness of the ancient literature on the period, which hardly suffices to construct a coherent narra-

tive of events. In the present book Hüttl has made a resolute attempt to bridge the gaps in our record by pressing into service all the available written material, and especially the coins and inscriptions which throw additional light on the subject. The thoroughness of his labours is best exemplified by the second volume, containing a prosopography of the reign, and a collection of all inscriptions in which Antoninus is mentioned. (Extensive as these lists are, they have been amplified in an appendix to vol. I.) But his untiring industry is also in evidence in the copious notes to the text of vol. I, in which the problems involved in the interpretation of the sources are carefully discussed.

On the other hand, Hüttl has defined the scope of his history somewhat narrowly. He omits from his survey the economic activities and municipal life of the Antonine period, though these constitute two of its most distinctive features. Moreover, within his restricted field

of studies he sets himself to register the facts rather than to discuss them. He is sparing of comment and propounds no new theories. Though he fills in the picture with many new details, he leaves its outlines unaltered.

The fruits of Hüttl's industry are garnered in special abundance in the chapter on frontier defence, which provides full details of the military establishment on the more lively frontiers. This chapter, however, will appeal mainly to specialists. A wider interest attaches to his account of Antoninus' reforms in the Roman law, which he presents in a form easily intelligible to laymen, and to his comprehensive survey of the religions of the Roman empire.

Taken as a whole, Hüttl's book is too full in one direction, and too incomplete in another, for the general reader. But as an instrument of future research on the Antonine age it will be indispensable.

M. CARY.

University of London.

THE STORY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD.

The Story of the Ancient World from the Earliest Times to the Fall of Rome.

By H. A. CLEMENT. Pp. 256; numerous figures in text. London: Harrap, 1936. Cloth, 3s.

THIS book represents a very interesting and praiseworthy attempt to supply what is likely to become more and more necessary with the increasing congestion of education—a reliable treatment in outline of a subject too long and complicated to be studied in detail. In this case it is the history of Antiquity that is to be made accessible to students of later history, British and European. Only a small selection obviously can be made out of the multitude of facts available. Success or failure will depend not so much on absolute accuracy in every detail, as on the truth and appeal of the general pictures that emerge. It is on these lines, then, that such a book should be judged.

Let us look more closely at a single chapter and see how it stands the test of criticism: Chapter XII, 'How the

Roman Kingdom became a Republic' (pp. 174-183). The proportions are reasonably good, but there is perhaps a little too much of the Kings and of the 'Lays of Ancient Rome'. A reasonably clear and consecutive story is evolved, and a course is cleverly steered between difficulties. The general picture is fairly true, as we must count truth in such a period. In detail there are a few unnecessary oversights. Carthaginians and Gauls were not in Italy 'when our story begins' (p. 174), and it is very misleading to speak of 'two' tribunes, without telling the whole story (p. 182). Allowing for the special object, we must consider the chapter a success. The verdict on this one chapter may probably be extended not unjustly to the whole book, though Mr. Clement might perhaps prefer to be appraised on such a chapter as X, 'Life in Fifth-Century Athens' (pp. 145-157), where there is less need for absolute exactness in every detail and perhaps more scope for his special method.

The real test of a book like this must

always be in the schools. Outlines are needed there and must be judged by their power of meeting the demands made on them. In our judgement Mr. Clement's book deserves a careful trial: it may be that, with the correction of

a few obvious and easily removable errors, it may settle down to a long career of usefulness.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

FROM UR TO ROME.

From Ur to Rome, being History, Secondary Series, Book One: pp. viii + 262; figures and maps. Reference Book: pp. xv + 223. By K. M. GADD. London: Ginn, 1936. Cloth, 3s. and 4s.

THIS work, which is designed to give children of eleven their first grounding in Ancient History, is divided into two parts: Volume I carries a thread of narrative from Ur to Rome through such chapters as 'Ur of the Chaldees', 'The Learning of the Ancient East', 'The Assyrian Empire', 'The World of Homer', 'The Athenians at Home', 'The Roman Republic'. Volume II gives historical notes in some fulness and, finally, a number of ancient texts in translation. Volume I is illustrated freely from ancient sculptures, coins, and works of minor art. Only actual experience with a class can decide how far the book succeeds in the task it has set before it. One reviewer at least thought that history was presented here in a most appetizing form and mentally congratulated the classes that would enjoy such a pleasant approach to the ancient world.

In books of this kind a new technique is being evolved—or at least improved out of all knowledge—the technique of giving instruction in outline, that shall have real significance and interest where it is hopeless even to begin to teach full exactness of detail. Success in this new method depends as much on art as on

science—as much on tactful selection of the relevant and skilful colouring of the background as on sheer knowledge of facts. This book will certainly quicken and stimulate the imagination of its pupils. Will it also prepare them for a knowledge that is not only imaginative but as faithful as possible to facts as they are recorded? As far as we can judge, it should succeed in both tasks. Chapter-headings and leading themes are carefully selected, a point here and there is set in high light, while much is completely omitted: but inclusion and omission are evidently not haphazard, but governed by a definite sense of what has significance and attractive power. The final section, with translations from sources, is a sheer delight, for the passages are well chosen and the translations are essentially vital. In the hands of a good teacher they should charm the class and awaken a taste for more. As all scholars know, Ancient History is not really dull; under its grey surface there are always fires burning. The new style of teaching aims at making the pupils realize something of the burning interest before being broken in by the weight of facts to be learned. On the success of this new style the future fate of the Classics must largely depend. We wish all success to a book that sets out so bravely on so worthy a task.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

THE ROMAN'S WORLD.

F. G. MOORE: *The Roman's World*. Pp. xiii + 502; 47 photos., 10 maps and plans. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 18s. 6d.

THIS is by way of a 'Companion to Roman Studies', on a somewhat more

extended and 'popular' plan than usual—characteristic of its country of origin, where the appetite for information in such simplified form about all periods and aspects of 'culture' is enviably common and voracious. One may hope that such provision as Pro-

fessor Moore makes for feeding it will have—on both sides of the Atlantic—the effect of stimulating the desire for more direct study.

The book begins with two chapters of historical survey, ranging from the time of the early cemetery in the Forum to that of the widest extension of the Empire under Trajan. This, though naturally much too summary and sketchy to give more than a very general perspective—and not quite impeccably accurate in its statements of fact—is not without value as providing a chronological framework for what follows; and the brief explanations of the system of 'federate' states, of *coloniae* and *municipia*, of the nature of the *provinciae*, and of the army organization—in a word, of the Roman instruments and methods of dominion—are clear and good.

The remaining ten chapters survey the several departments of life in the Roman world: agriculture, industry and commerce, religion, amusements, the

family, education, literature, philosophy and science, and the fine arts, with a historical description of the city of Rome and an appendix treating the army in further detail. Throughout, the writing is lucid and pleasant, if sometimes a little irritating in its conscientiously ingratiating method of presentation—as when a sketch of Latin literature is disguised as *catalogues raisonnés* of the presumable contents of Sallust's library and of that adjoining the Basilica Ulpia.

But on the whole the most attractive part of the volume is the illustrations, which are grouped together in some fifty pages at the end: photographs, mostly of buildings, skilfully chosen and excellently printed, with several good maps and plans, including very useful ones of the Forum Romanum and the Fora of the Emperors. The bibliographies, general and special, are full and judicious.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

ATTIC BLACK-FIGURED LEKYTHOI.

C. H. Emilie HASPELS: *Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi*. Pp. x+407; 54 plates. (Ecole Française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires . . ., Fasc. IV.) Paris: Boccard, 1936. Cloth and boards.

Black-figured *lekythi* are an embarrassment to the museum director. Most museums possess some of these small vases, often carelessly drawn, often with subjects difficult of interpretation. The idle label them black-figured *lekythi* and leave it at that. The energetic search for parallels and dates in Ure's *Rhithsona* books and in the Oxford Corpus. Miss Haspels' work therefore comes as a relief to the energetic and a spur to the idle. Her earlier work on the suspension of the *aryballos* showed her capacity for detailed and accurate study. On black-figured *lekythi* she had ample opportunity for employing it.

Black-figured *lekythi* run from about the beginning of the sixth century B.C. to about the middle of the fifth. They start as a derivative from the Corinthian *alabastron* and end under the pressure

of red-figure and outline competition. Some idea of the size of the undertaking can be gathered from the fact that there are no less than sixty pages of Museum Index. Miss Haspels proceeds chronologically and divides her material into seventeen main groups—the main groups are usually the *œuvre* of a single painter and often the output of a single workshop. Round the closer group more loosely connected groups which show the influence of the master are arranged. The groups are excellently illustrated by the fifty-four plates, which are well produced from good photographs. The shape of the *lekythus* is often in itself distinctive; but sometimes the painter paints *lekythi* of several types, and his style can be traced beyond *lekythi* to cups and wine-jars. Thus we see the painters of *lekythi* in their relation to the better-known vase-painters, and Miss Haspels is always ready to point out stylistic connections with the Amasis painter, the Menon painter, the Berlin painter, and other famous figures of black- and red-figure painting. Style both of pic-

ture and ornament is the chief criterion of grouping, and Miss Haspels' sense of style is excellent.

The book is close-packed, specialist and scholarly, but not unduly difficult to read, partly because the English is fresh and witty, partly because the writer allows herself digressions on various topics suggested by her vases. Thus she writes on pouring out of jugs (p. 13), on distortion and motion in painting (p. 44), on hairdressing (p. 66), on division of labour in pottery (p. 94), on *alabastra* (p. 101), on the dating of Rhitsona graves, Group B (p. 108), on Helios scenes (p. 120), on vases

inscribed with the names of perfumes (p. 125), on the uses of *lecythi* (p. 127), on firing pottery (p. 155), on pattern vases (p. 181 f.), and on the pictorial style (p. 190). These digressions are worthy of mention because all are valuable, and though they arise naturally out of the subject, they would not necessarily be looked for in a book on black-figured *lecythi*. Miss Haspels is to be congratulated on an admirable piece of work which merits the most careful attention from all archaeologists and curators of museums.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

A. E. HOUSMAN: *Introductory Lecture*, 1892. Pp. 41. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Boards, 2s.

THIS lecture, twice already privately printed but now for the first time published, was delivered to the united Faculties of University College, London, when Housman was entering on his duties as Professor of Latin. It deserves to be made public for more than one reason: for its theme, as a defence of the pursuit of learning for its own sake and a warning against the nonsense which is often talked by specialists who ought to know better; for its style, as a masterly piece of English prose, touched with that irony which was to become more bitter with the years. Housman himself called it 'rhetorical'. But it is grand rhetoric, sometimes playful, sometimes sublimely earnest, always pointed and candid. Of the sincerity of its purpose one cannot doubt. It is a call to students to work together towards setting back the frontier of darkness; the cause which it pleads is the cause of truth, and that was the passion of Housman's life. C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Food in Early Greece. By K. F. VICKERY. Pp. 100. (Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, Vol. XX, No. 3.) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1936. Paper, \$1.

THIS is an industrious collection of evidence, mainly archaeological, for the prehistoric periods in Greece, down to the end of the Bronze Age. Linguistic evidence occupies a short chapter, mainly concerned with those Greek words for food-stuffs which have been thought by Cuny and others to be early loan-words. The data are marshalled first under sites, in regional order, then under categories, with chapters also on hunting, trade in food, and cooking. As the author comments on 'the almost complete absence of literary records', he evidently regards Homeric Greece as outside his subject, and only rarely alludes even to the Homeric vocabulary (e.g. *ἰνὸς*, p. 50), or Homeric practices (fishing, pp. 73-5; Penelope's

geese, p. 67). But, within self-imposed limits, he has produced a handy book of reference.

Oxford.

J. L. MYRES.

Gerhard STEINKOPF: *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Ruhmes bei den Griechen*. Pp. vi + 102. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1937. Paper. THIS is a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy presented to the University of Halle in 1936. The title is perhaps rather misleading, as the work is in fact a semasiological study of the words meaning 'fame' in a selection of Greek authors. It is divided into three parts—I, a short general introduction on the problem to be considered (pp. 1-3); II, the main body of the work (pp. 4-97); and III, a short summing-up (pp. 98-101). Part II is divided into six sections—on Homer (4-36); Hesiod (37-42); Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes, Theognis, Empedocles, Archilochus and Semonides (42-52); Pindar (53-73); Herodotus (73-82); and Thucydides (82-97). The work is a useful example of its type, and it will be of value to those who are interested in the evidence for the history of Greek thought to be obtained by the detailed study of common words like *κλέος*, *κῦδος* and *τιμή*. So far as I have checked it, the treatment of the selected authors is both full and accurate; though it might be suggested that Dr. Steinkopf would have done well to confine himself to the earlier writers (say down to Pindar), and to have made a complete study of them. There is a curiously arbitrary flavour about the selection of authors in the third section of Part II (what Empedocles is doing in this gallery I find hard to understand), and Herodotus and Thucydides deserve more detailed treatment than can be given them in a study like this. A more serious criticism is the absence of any *Index Locorum*; though it would have increased the bulk of the book, it would have greatly enhanced its usefulness to the student, especially as Dr. Steinkopf refers to authors outside his special selection.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

A. SVENSSON: *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik*. Pp. xii + 160. Lund: Gleerup, 1937. Paper.

THIS unusually solid and unusually well printed doctoral dissertation is by a pupil of Professor Wifstrand and deals in detail with a subject on which Wifstrand has himself touched. The examples of the article in epic from Apollonius to Nonnus and his school are collected and classified, the non-Homeric uses are distinguished, and a number of passages in which the poet's practice should be taken into account by his editors are discussed. There are appendices on the colour of $\delta \alpha \nu \eta \rho$, $\delta \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \varsigma$ and similar articulated substantives, and on certain aberrant examples of δ , η , $\tau \acute{o}$ used with adversatives as introductory pronouns.

The subject is not one from which epoch-making results were to be expected, but some of Dr. Svensson's statistics are surprising, and he appears to have settled some minor textual problems. The work was worth doing, and, so far as I can judge, has been done thoroughly and competently. It is to be followed by a similar study of didactic poetry.

A. S. F. GOW.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

A Trojan Ending, by LAURA RIDING. Pp. xxviii + 436; 1 map. London: Constable, 1937. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

THIS bold reconstruction of life at Troy during the War is an interesting and vivid piece of work, based upon later story-tellers as well as upon Homer: the authoress deliberately departs from the Homeric tradition to attain greater verisimilitude (e.g. Achilles fights his final duel with a half-blinded Hector). 'Legends', she says, 'are themselves neither truth nor falsehood; they represent invitations to knowledge' (p. xx.). She writes with enthusiasm of Walter Leaf, 'the Trojan among the Greeks of Homeric scholarship'; but no classical bias lured her to Troy: it was the thought of Cressida, 'a name on the surface of a story', associated in Miss Riding's mind with 'courage', Cressida, leaving Troy for the Greek camp, makes 'a Trojan ending'; and the book itself has a Trojan ending, 'as Cressida would have wished'. The writer finds in the story of Troy 'a physical freshness and youth that matches our minds of now as no other story of the past does'; and notwithstanding the burden of personal names and place-names (her Index of Principal Characters fills four pages, two for Trojans, two for Greeks, some of the names being, alas!, misprinted here and in the text), she claims for her novel 'the endearing virtue of homeliness'.

The story is mingled with moralizing and discussion of its after-fame. Conversations and motives are characteristically modern. Trojan sayings are invented, e.g. 'The stranger brings the rainbow', 'A Trojan's house is his stool'; and Paris uses 'the inverted form of the proverb', 'Fear most the Greeks when gifts you bring them'. Myth-talks and inquiries into customs and ritual are frequent: Cassandra expatiates upon the swastika, Achilles condemns

poisoned arrows. Ugly incidents inevitable in war are not excluded; but the whole is shot with poetry, and the style in general distinguished. The critic, however, has a right to object to 'Aren't I?' (p. 190) in the mouth of Diomedes, and to the 'barrows' in which the Greeks 'wheeled corpses from the Plain' (p. 161); but these lapses are exceptional. A useful map is added.

W. G. WADDELL.

University of Egypt, Cairo.

V. C. B. COUTANT: *Alexander of Aphrodisias: Commentary on Book IV of Aristotle's Meteorologica* (English translation with Introduction and Notes). Pp. 99. New York: Columbia University, 1936. Paper.

MR. COUTANT considers in his Introduction the authenticity of the fourth book of the *Meteorologica* and the history of opinion about it; he opposes the essay of Dr. Hammer-Jensen in *Hermes*, L, and having made out a very plausible case against her, concludes that the book may well be of Aristotelian authorship; its present position is unjustified, because it is in no sense a fourth book of the *Meteorologica*, and it is best described as a kind of independent sequel to the *de Generatione et Corruptione*. Mr. Coutant's work is interesting in another way as being probably the first translation into English of one of the ancient commentaries. The translation is sound and literal.

D. J. ALLAN.

Balliol College, Oxford.

H. ZILLIACUS: *De elocutione Marci Aurelii imperatoris quaestiones syntacticae*. Pp. 31. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, IX. 2). Helsingfors: Akademische Buchhandlung (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1937. Paper, Fmk 12.

THE greater part of this work is an examination of Marcus Aurelius' use of the infinitives and the participles. The author's general conclusion is that Marcus for the most part employs the Greek of educated men of his day, though differing from it in some points (p. 2). The work unfortunately is very careless and completely unreliable in details.

As an example of *συμπερινοεῖν* with the infinitive we are given, p. 15, *μὴ συμπερινοεῖν ἐπίπνοια οἷα καὶ ὅσα πιθανὸν ἐπιγενεῖσθαι*; as an example of *αἰσθάνεσθαι* with the participle, p. 27, *οὐκ αἰσθάνη πῶσα παρέχεσθαι δυνάμενος* [sc. αἰ]; as an example of a participle used in a final sense, p. 29, *πρὸ πάντων δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν λογικῶς καὶ κοινωνικῶς ἔχουσαν* [sc. διασφεί]; as examples of the accusative absolute, p. 30, *συνελόντι δὲ εἰπεῖν* and *[πάν τὸ . . . καλὸν] οὐκ ἔχον μέρος ἑαυτοῦ τὸν ἔπαινον*. On p. 13 *μόλις* is an adjective; on p. 15 *ἐκμελετᾶν* is a verb 'sentiendi'; on p. 19 *γλίχεσθαι* etc. are verbs 'prohibendi'. And what is to be made of 'προσποιεῖσθαι semper cum ἵνα adhibetur ut IX 29 πείθεσθαι προσποιουμένων' (p. 12)? Nor was it only Romans writing Greek who used the perfect where one might have expected the aorist (p. 4).

In the 31 pages there are over 70 misprints.

The Latin is obscure and often seriously wrong: *significatio* (twice), *notio* and *enuntiatum* (*enuntiatos secundarios*) occur as masculine, *ambitus* as feminine (*copiosae . . . ambitus*); *ephemerin* is the accusative; *prioris hellenisticae partis aetatis* means 'the first part of the hellenistic age'; on p. 3 we find the word *ephemerici* and the strange combination *ab aliquo quodam*; the last words of the treatise are *Prelis data mense Januarius* 1937. Of the other serious errors in Latin some may perhaps be ascribed to misprints, but there still remain many longer passages whose Latinity is, to say the least, highly doubtful. M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

Thomas CUTT: *Meter and Diction in Catullus' Hendecasyllabics*. Pp. 67. Chicago: private edition, distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1936. Paper.

THE purpose of this doctoral dissertation is, first, to establish statistically the principles of structure of the Phalaecian as Catullus wrote it and, secondly, to observe the restrictions on language which these principles involved. Mr. Cutt finds (what was not unknown) that Catullus (1), like his successors, prefers a word of more than two syllables at the end of the line (such words account for about 70 per cent. of his endings), and (2) avoids dividing between two words the 'pyrrhic sequence' of the fourth and fifth syllables: in 91 per cent. of his lines these syllables belong to one word or word-group and some at any rate of the exceptions admit of explanation. He then proceeds to show how these preferences affect the number of occurrences of each 'word-type' (or particular combination of quantities forming a word) and its position in the line. Two types in particular are metrically useful—polysyllables ending in *-io* and words containing two successive shorts; he examines certain large classes of words falling under these types—diminutives (which account for 10 per cent. of C.'s line-endings), comparatives, abstract nouns in *-atio* and *-or*, adjectives in *-osus*, genitives plural; words in *-ius* and *-ia*, pyrrhic pronouns—and suggests that metre is one of the factors determining C.'s use of them. A classical poet cannot be above considerations of longs and shorts, but his language is not dictated by them alone. Not the least merit of Mr. Cutt's study is that he realizes this; he does not forget that words are used, by poets and by other people, because they mean something, and he has also some interesting observations on the sound-values of certain kinds of words. His work is a useful complement to what has been done for dactylic verse; would that all writers of theses were as careful and as sensible.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

R. SPADACCINI: *Una vittima minore dell'eruzione Vesuviana del 79 D.C.: Retina*. (From *Rivista di Studi Pompeiani*, II.) Pp. 24. Naples, 1936. Paper.

THE eruption of Vesuvius claimed a variety of victims, including the Prefect of the Fleet of Misenum and the son of Felix and Drusilla.

One of them lurks in a 'locus desperatissimus' of Pliny's account of his uncle's end (*Epp.* VI, 16, 8). It runs as follows (in Keil's text), 'egrediebatur domo: accipit codicillos Rectinae† Tasci imminenti periculo exterritae (nam villa eius subiacebat, nec ulla nisi navibus fuga): ut se tanto discrimini eriperet orabat'. Who—or what—is 'Rectinae Tasci'? In the conventional view, the corrupt words conceal the name of some eminent female, possessor of a villa. Mr. Spadaccini is not satisfied with this. He proceeds to an exhaustive examination of the manuscripts of Pliny and the history of the text. Then, on the hypothesis that Rectina, or rather Retina, is a place-name, suggests that it may be a fleet-station, for the elder Pliny was admiral after all—'Miseni classem praesens imperio regebat'. So he proposes to read 'Retinae classis' in the crucial passage, and would localize Retina near Herculaneum, which might be right. At the least, we must be thankful to Mr. Spadaccini for a full discussion of this textual (and perhaps topographical) theme.

R. SYME.

Trinity College, Oxford.

Sister Margaret Clare HERRON: *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome*. Pp. xiv + 132. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1937. Paper, \$2.

SOMETHING like 'ten thousand sentence-endings and, in addition, slightly more than two thousand two hundred endings before weak pauses within the sentence have been collected and classified' for the present work. The basis seems sufficiently broad, and the right principle has been adopted in distinguishing the different styles of St. Jerome. But it may be doubted if the best selection of texts has been made. It cannot be too strongly insisted on that the edition of Vallarsi, though a most creditable performance for a solitary Italian in the eighteenth century, is not up to the modern standard especially as the numerous MSS north of the Alps were only indirectly available to the editor. Sister Margaret Clare rightly uses Hilberg's edition of the Epistles, but she ignores Richardson's edition of the *De Viris Illustribus*, and chooses the commentary on Isaiah as edited by Vallarsi in preference to Reiter's edition of the commentary on Jeremiah, which, excellent as it is, is quite unknown to her. Further, the most suitable work for the illustration of Jerome's easier style, the Homilies published by Dom Morin, has been left entirely unused. The same is true of the chief work on Jerome's style, that of Henri Goelzer. 'M. Hilberg' appears on p. vi instead of 'I. Hilberg'; Bonnell's antiquated edition of Quintilian instead of Rademacher's (p. xii); on p. 1 we find 'de rigueur', an instance of a reprehensible habit known also on this side of the Atlantic, the pretentious use of foreign words whose form or meaning is unknown to the user. On p. 13 *monachorum* is twice treated as if the antepenult were long.

But when all these strictures have been made, it is only just to commend the writer's great industry, and to point out that she has made a

contribution of real importance to the study of
rhythmical prose. A. SOUTER.
Oxford.

LEO T. PHILLIPS: *The Subordinate Temporal, Causal, and Adversative Clauses in the Works of St. Ambrose*. Pp. xiv + 165. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1937. Paper, \$2.

THIS is the sixth volume that the 'Patristic Studies' of the Catholic University of America have contributed to the study of St. Ambrose. The works of St. Ambrose are on the whole preserved in rather poor manuscripts, and only a portion of them is edited in a manner satisfactory to modern requirements, but it is not probable that the results of an investigation like the present will be seriously modified when a complete critical edition is in our hands. The topic of the present work is one that must appeal to all who are interested in the development of the usage of those most subtle of words, the particles. The author has studied Latin usage in the best grammars and has a good sense of historical perspective. As a matter of fact, all our conclusions with regard to the uses of certain particles will have to be revised some day in the light of palaeography; I mean, the confusion between *autem* and *enim*, *quod* and *quia*, *quando* and *quoniam* respectively, due to wrong resolution of abbreviations by scribes: but the time for this is not yet. Dr. Phillips' careful work is furnished with an excellent summary and index, and can be confidently recommended to the student. St. Ambrose has been rather neglected in comparison with his great contemporaries Jerome and Augustine, but Dr. Dudden's entrancing work on his life and times, and these studies from Washington, ought to revive interest in him.

Oxford.

A. SOUTER.

Th. SIMENSCHV: *Gramatica Limbii Grecești. Partea Ia: Fonetica și Morfologia*. Pp. 205. Bucharest: 'Cartea Românească,' 1935. Paper, lei 200.

THIS is an introductory Greek grammar for Rumanian students, but though its purpose is merely descriptive, the exposition is enlivened by comparative and historical remarks which show that the author is familiar with the authoritative handbooks. The present volume deals with phonology and morphology, and the introduction contains a brief account of the history of the language, the division of the dialects, and the development of the alphabet. It is, of course, in syntax that the pedagogic value of the comparative and historical methods is most revealed, and we await the second volume. If this exhibits the same scientific trustworthiness and pedagogical skill as the present volume, then Rumanian students will be fortunate in possessing a Greek grammar of a kind which has yet to be written for our own.

L. R. PALMER.

University of Manchester.

J. B. HOFMANN: *Lateinische Umgangssprache*. Zweite, durch Nachträge vermehrte Auflage. Pp. xvi + 214. Heidelberg: Winter, 1936. Paper, RM. 4.50 (bound, 6); the Nachträge alone, 1.

THE first edition of this classification of Latin colloquial expressions was published in 1926 and reviewed in *C.R.* 1927, p. 90. This second edition is a reprint of the first, with thirty pages of additions and corrections (including five pages of indexes to the additions).

The additional matter is divided into two parts. The first part contains, besides a supplementary bibliography giving a list of relevant works published since 1926, a wealth of references to modern publications bearing on the subjects dealt with in each section. Many additional examples from ancient authors are quoted, and a few wrong or irrelevant references corrected. On p. 195 there is a new section on Terms of Endearment, which might be inserted either after § 82 (on Terms of Abuse) or after § 129 (on Diminutives).

The second part of the additions consists of four pages of parallel passages to illustrate the difference between the colloquial and the higher style. For instance, passages from a letter of Cicero to Atticus written in the colloquial style are set beside passages from an official letter to Cato on the same subject.

In this enlarged edition of his book Dr. Hofmann does more justice to his wide reading. The references have added considerably to the value of the book, especially as they take account of ten more years of research.

E. C. WOODCOCK.

University of Manchester.

G. HANFMANN: *Altetruskische Plastik. I: Die menschliche Gestalt in der Rundplastik bis zum Ausgang der orientalisierenden Kunst*. Pp. xii + 135; 15 figures. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1936. Paper.

LITTLE puppets of clay are found in the huts of iron age Latium, and neighbouring Etruria, rather suddenly about the turn of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., becomes populated with a mass of figures in many materials—bronze, gold, amber, ivory, and clay: some of them imports from overseas but many undoubtedly of native fabric. Dr. Hanfmann has chosen this outburst of plastic activity as the subject of his doctoral dissertation, classifying the material and tracing the types to their sources, which are to be found almost entirely in the Orient; one important result of the analysis is to bring out the trifling extent of the influence exercised on the local art by Egypt, in spite of the wealth of imported Egyptian pieces. He attributes this artistic movement entirely to Etruscan influence, even where the actual makers are Italians; and here a paradox arises, which merits attention. Dr. Hanfmann is at pains to distinguish between Italic and Etruscan works—both copying Eastern originals, the Etruscan copying being closer in execution, the Italic more barbaric. If this distinction be sound, as it probably is, it follows that a generation at least elapsed before the Etruscans produced anything; for the Italic

style was established in the eighth century, while the Etruscan works—the bucchero figurines, the statuettes of Montalto di Castro, the Pietrera sculptures—appear well down in the seventh. How far down cannot be said till we are more settled in regard to the seventh-century chronology of Etruria. Dr. Hanfmann follows Åberg in putting Regolini-Galassi at 680, a compromise dating which is fashionable at the moment, but which does not account for the contradictory nature of the evidence: the linear skyphoi drawing us up to 700, the thoroughly sophisticated bird-bowl, as Karo saw, dragging us below 650. Some light on this hotly-disputed point may be thrown by the publication of Sir L. Woolley's recent excavations on the Syrian coast, for while these confirm the late date of the bird-bowl they also suggest that linear Protocorinthian lingered well down in the seventh century. We shall await with interest the conclusion of this valuable and closely-documented study. A few mis-references will not cause serious trouble, but I may observe that the Blacas figurine no. 1 is not in the British Museum (see *CVA. Gr. Brit.* 433, 14, text). F. N. PRYCE.

British Museum.

Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Gorgiam Commentaria. Edidit W. NORVIN. Pp. ii + 250. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1936. Export prices: paper, RM. 9.60; bound, 10.50.

THE hopelessly dull moralizing observations of the younger Olympiodorus on the Platonic *Gorgias* were published for the first time by A. Jahn in 1848, as the present editor says, from inferior MSS. Mr. Norvin pins his own faith so completely to their archetype, Marcianus Gr. 196, that I suppose his text must be presumed to be in intention little more than a transcript of that MS. If it is a faithful transcript, it follows at once that the scribe has made endless errors in division of words, in accentuation, and, above all, in punctuation, which any man unfortunate enough to be condemned to read the lucubrations of Olympiodorus will have to correct for himself, as the editor passes them without remark; in not a few passages the text is further manifestly corrupt. Some, though certainly not all, of these numerous faults may probably be due to

extreme carelessness on the part of compositor and proof-corrector; others perhaps, especially the sense-pervverting punctuation by which colons are constantly printed where what is required is a comma, a question-mark, a full-stop, or no stop at all, may be due to a perverse determination of the editor to follow a medieval scribe in all his vagaries. Whatever the precise explanation, I regret to have to say that this particular volume is far the worst edited Greek text which has come into my hands for a long time. I subjoin a few examples of the kind of thing a reader is, on almost every page, left to set right for himself. (They are taken almost at random.) 28, 11 ψυχὴν λογικὴν καὶ νοερὰν χαρίζεσθαι (l. χωρίζεσθαι); 36, 29 νοημάτων ἐπαγγελίας (l. ἀπαγγελίας, cf. 37, 1); 37, 28 ὅτι ἀνέχῃ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λέγοντος, ψεύδεται (l. λέγοντος; 'will you stand his saying this? He lies.'). 60, 31 ἡ ἐρώτησον καὶ ἀποκρίνεμαι ἡ ἐρωτῶ (sic) τοῦτο δὲ ποιεῖ θαρρῶν (l. ἡ ἐρώτω, τοῦτο δὲ ποιεῖ); 86, 16 πῶς λέγεις ἀποκτείνων δίκαιως ἢ ἀδίκως (l. ἀποκτείνων; δίκαιως ἢ ἀδίκως); 91, 22 δεῖ διαβρῶσαι τὰ τε εἰδη προαποδεδειγμένα (l. τὰ τε ἥδη); 92, 25 ψευδῆ φάσκων πάντα δίκαιον εὐδαίμονα εἶναι (l. ψεύδῃ); 113, 4 ἔσται ἥττων ἀθλιος (l. ἥττον); 119, 2 μὴ δόλος (l. μὴ δόλις); 224, 19 τὴν γῆν ἐργάζοντες (l. ἐργάζονται); ἡ κναρέα κρύπτει τὴν κεφαλὴν (l. ἡ κνέρη); 236, 31 εἰ ἀπορήτων (l. ἀπορείτων ὅς ἀπορήτων); 237, 17 δίκαστής δὲ λέγεται, οὐκ δίκαστής (l. οὐκ δικάστης); 238, 30 προστιθεῖσι χωρὶς, εἰ μὴ κτλ. (l. προστιθέας, χωρὶς εἰ μὴ κτλ., 'they add to them, unless inhibited by philosophy'). A. E. TAYLOR.

University of Edinburgh.

Scepticism and Poetry. An essay on the poetic imagination, by D. G. JAMES. Pp. 274. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.

THIS very readable essay successfully vindicates the doctrine of the 'creative imagination' with the help of Coleridge and Wordsworth ('reason in her most exalted mood') in opposition to the psycho-physiological aesthetic of I. A. Richards (and B. Russell). The 'scepticism' of the title refers to the author's view (reminiscent of Maritain, whom he does not mention) that the imagination ceases to be poetic when the poet seeks an abstract and systematic philosophy. In conclusion there is a discussion of the theories of H. Brémond (sic). J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a review or mention in the *Classical Review*.)

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JULY 31–SEPTEMBER 18, 1937, NOS. 31–38.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—D. M. Robinson, *Pindar a poet of eternal ideas* [*C.R.* L. 237] (E. Kalinka). An estimate of importance, suitable for the general reader.—E. Ziebarth, *Eine Handelsrede aus der Zeit des Demosthenes, die Rede XXXIV gegen Phormion, mit Einleitung und Sachkommentar* [*C.R.* LI. 84] (C. Rüger).

The introduction and commentary are particularly welcome.—P. G. M. J. Janssens, *Hoofdbegrippen uit de platonische dialogen Lysis en Symposium* [Maastricht, 1935. Pp. xii + 148] (A. Kraemer). Mainly on the relation between ἔρως and φιλία in Plato. A work of much learning.—*Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* V 10, 2. 1: Galeni in Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum III commentaria III ed. E. Wenkebach [*C.R.* LI. 47] (F. E. Kind). In this, the first

half of the second volume, W.'s thoroughness and learning are again apparent. K. discusses some readings.—H. Dörrie, *De Longi, Achilles Tatii, Heliodori memoria* [Göttingen, 1935. Pp. 119] (B. A. Müller). In a long review M. expresses scepticism about some points in D.'s discussion of the MSS. and disagrees with some of his readings.—*Papyri Varsovienses* ed. G. Manteuffel [C.R. XLIX. 241] (K. F. W. Schmidt). S. finds many of M.'s readings unintelligible and makes numerous suggestions. He welcomes the photographic reproductions.—A. Grossinsky, *Das Programm des Thukydides* [C.R. L. 174] (H. Oetzmann). An interpretation of Thuc. I 22 of which O. approves.—W. E. J. Kuiper, *Griekische Origineelen en Latijnsche Navolgen: zes komedies van Menander bij Terentius en Plautus* [C.R. L. 208] (A. Klotz). K. has added considerably to our knowledge of M. though many of his suppositions will not stand investigation.—*Clemens Alexandrinus*. Hrsg. von O. Stählin. 4. Band, 2. Teil, 1. u. 2. Hälfte. Wort- und Sachregister [Leipzig, 1936]. Die griech. christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 39, 2 und 3] (P. Hessler). H. praises the index very highly.

LATIN LITERATURE.—*Cornelius Tacitus edd. Halm-Andresen II 2. Germania, Agricola, Dialogus de oratoribus*, ed. E. Köstermann [C.R. LI. 149] (A. Gudeman). G. criticizes in a number of instances K.'s choice of readings and wishes that this edition of the *opera omnia* were free from minor faults.—*César, La guerre civile*. Tome I (livres I et II). Tome II (livre III). Texte établi et traduit par P. Fabre [C.R. LI. 133] (A. Klotz). K. approves heartily, but mentions a few readings with which he disagrees.—*M. T. Cicerone, Pro rege Deiotaro* con introduzione e commento di A. Giusti [Naples, 1933] (A. Klotz). Will fulfil its purpose as a school edition.—E. T. Sage, *Livy with an English translation. Vol. XI. Books XXXVIII-XXXIX* [C.R. LI. 135] (A. Klotz). Text in general wins approval, and translation is careful. K. criticizes some readings.—H. Steinbeiss, *Das Geschichtsbild Claudians* [Halle, 1936. Pp. 68] (R. Helm). Analyses C.'s attitude towards earlier as well as contemporary Roman history.—J. C. Plümpe, *Wesen und Wirkung der auctoritas maiorum bei Cicero* [Münster, 1935. Pp. 76] (A. Klotz). A useful discussion.—*Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. . . . Tom. II., Vol. II., Pars 2. Edidit Ed. Schwarz [1936, de Gruyter. Pp. xx+119] (G. Souter). S. gives summary of contents.

HISTORY.—B. Lavagnini, *Saggio sulla storiografia greca* [C.R. XLVII. 131] (A. Kraemer). An inspiring review of Greek historiography. K. summarizes.—R. Andreotti, *Il regno dell'imperatore Giuliano* [Bologna, 1936. Pp. 206] (Th. Lenschau). A. gives a good account of the earlier part of Julian's career and is always interesting, although the later chapters on Julian as Emperor are not so satisfactory.—W. M. Hugill, *Panhellenism in Aristophanes* [C.R. LI. 14] (E. Wüst). W. disapproves of the attempt to read into A. serious political convictions.—C. Lanzani, *Lucio Cornelio Silla Dittatore. Storia di Roma negli anni 82-78 a.C.*

[C.R. L. 193] (E. Hohl). The idealization of S. is too extravagant.—A. Schober, *Die Römerzeit in Österreich, dargestellt an den Bau- und Kunstdenkmälern* [Baden, Vienna, 1935. Rohrer. Pp. 112 with 91 illustrations] (E. Gerster). An instructive and well-illustrated exposition of the intermingling of native with Roman culture.

LANGUAGE.—H. Frisk, 'Wahrheit' und 'Lüge' in den indogermanischen Sprachen. Einige morphologische Beobachtungen [Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XLI, 1935: 3. Pp. 39] (W. Luther). Careful work which suffers from being a purely morphological study. L. disagrees with F.'s derivation of ἀληθής, ἐτός and ἐρέος.—W. Brandenstein, *Die erste 'indogermanische' Wanderung* [Klothe, Hist. Studien 2. feudalen u. vorfeud. Welt, her. v. F. W. König, Band 2. Vienna, 1936. Pp. 88 with 2 maps] (E. Hermann). Attempts on semi-siological grounds to distinguish an earlier Idg. habitat from a later one not shared by the Indo-iranian section. H. thinks the time hardly ripe for these conclusions.—*Langenscheidts Taschenwörterbuch der neugriechischen und deutschen Sprache*. I. Teil: Neugriechisch-Deutsch von J. K. Mitsotakis. 4. Auflage mit einem Nachtrag von O. Dieringer. 1933. II. Teil: Deutsch-Neugriechisch von K. Dieterich. 5. Auflage, mit Nachtrag von O. Dieringer. 1935 (G. Souter). The supplements are new and add many words of modern coinage.

PHILOSOPHY.—M. Grabmann, *Mittelalterliche Deutung und Umbildung der aristotelischen Lehre vom νόος ποιητικός. Nach einer Zusammenstellung im Cod. B III 22 der Univ.-Bibl., Basel* [Sb. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss. 1936. Heft 4. Pp. 106] (A. Gudeman). Another important work from a great authority on mediaeval thought.—Kl. Buchmann, *Die Stellung des Menon in der Platonischen Philosophie* [C.R. LI. 122] (J. Pavlu). An important and convincing contribution to the study of Plato.

ART.—R. J. H. Jenkins, *Dedalic. A study of Dorian plastic art in the seventh century B.C.* [C.R. L. 233] (G. Lippold). J. derives from terracottas a chronological sequence of styles which is then applied to other works of art. A solid and convincing exposition, though L. makes some reservations.—B. Schweitzer, *Das Original der sog. Pasquinogruppe* [Abh. der phil.-hist. Kl. der sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. Bd. 43, Heft 4. Leipzig, 1936. Pp. 164, with 6 figures, 85 plates from drawings, 3 photographic plates] (J. Sieveking). A brilliant reconstruction of the group and discussion of its place in the history of art.—H. Philippart, *Les coupes attiques à fond blanc* [Brussels, 1936. L'Antiquité Classique V 1. With 2 illustrations and 34 photographic plates] (G. Lippold). A pleasant and well-illustrated review of all the material.

LAW.—E. Betti, *Diritto Romano. I. Parte generale* [Padua, 1935. Pp. xlv+768] (B. Kübler). K. praises very highly.

MISCELLANEOUS.—W. Gundel, *Dekane und Dekansterbilder. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Sternbilder der Kulturvölker. Mit einer Untersuchung über die ägyptischen Sternbilder und Gottheiten der Dekane* von S. Schott

[Studien der Bibl. Warburg XIX. Hamburg, 1936. Pp. x+452 with 33 plates] (A. Scherer). Important work which shows that some of the principal features of astrology are traceable to Egypt rather than to Babylonia.—A. Sigalas, *Ἱστορία τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γραφῆς* [Salonica, 1934. Pp. 327] (J. Kalitsunakis). A clear and useful review of the origin and development of Greek writing.—H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature. Vol. II* [Cambridge, 1936] (J. Schönemann). In the second volume of this important work the authors extend their survey to Russian, Yugoslav, Indian, and Hebrew literature.

COMMUNICATIONS.—31 July, A. Kurfess, *Pro domo* (cf. *Phil. Woch.* 1937, 621 sqq.) (13 lines).—7 Aug., P. Keseling, *Herodot 1, 32 und Sophokles* (1½ cols.).—21 Aug., P. Thielscher, *ἐν κλισίῳ δὲ θέντες* (1½ cols.).—28 Aug., J. Pavlu, *Textkritisches zur pseudoplatonischen Epinomis* (2 pp.).—4 Sept., P. Thielscher, *Wer sind die ἀπαρῶναι Ἐν. Marc. 2, 15-16?* (2½ cols.).—18 Sept., M. Schmidt, *Zu Hor. Sat. II 8* (2 cols.).

GNOMON.

XIII. 7. JULY, 1937.

(1) W. Rathmann: *Quaestiones Pythagorae Orphicae Empedocleae* [Diss. Halle, 1933. Pp. x+152]; (2) A. Krüger: *Quaestiones Orphicae* [C.R. XLIX. 69] (Gundert). Each has something to say on the most important aspects of Orphism. *Inscriptiones Creticae. I: Tituli Cretae mediae praeter Gortynios* cur. M. Guarducci [Rome: La libreria dello stato, 1935. Pp. xv+356, 1 map 4°] (v. Gaertringen). Interesting matter, but not conveniently arranged. H. Wilcken: *Zur oligarchischen Revolution in Athen vom Jahre 411 v. Chr.* [SBerl. phil.-hist. Kl. 1935, 3. Pp. 30] (Taeger). Open to criticism, but progressive. J. Melber: *Olympia* [Munich and Berlin: Oldenbourg, 1936. Pp. 154] (Jüthner). A popular book which is spoilt by M.'s unfortunate attempts at scholarship. H. Dörrie: *De Longi, Achillis Tattii, Heliodori Memoria* [Diss. Göttingen. Borna-Leipzig: Noske, 1935. Pp. xiii+119] (Rattenbury). A useful collection of material, but judging from the section on Heliodorus, D.'s conclusions are founded on inadequate and inaccurate evidence. E. Köstermann: *Untersuchungen zu den Dialogschriften Senecas* [SBerl. phil.-hist. Kl. 1934, 12. Pp. 69] (Dahlmann). D. disagrees with the whole book, against which he argues at length. (1) *Palladii Rutilii Tauri Aemiliani v. ill. Opus agriculturae, liber quartus decimus de veterinaria medicina*. Ed. J. Svennung [Göteborg: Eranos Förlag, 1926. Pp. xxvi+93, 1 plate]; (2) H. Wifstrand: *Palladiusstudien* [C.R. XLI. 45] (Grevander) (1). A careful edition. Sv. seems to prove the authenticity of the work. (2) W.'s observations are useful. Gr. comments on some in detail. A. v. Blumenthal: *Sophokles* [C.R. LI. 65] (Webster). In the main the plays are sympathetically and tellingly analysed. *Claudii Galeni Protrepticus ad medicinam*. Griechisch und deutsch hrsg. von W. John [Göttingen, 1936. Pp. 68]

(Schröder). A first German translation is added to a moderate text and an elementary but attractive introduction about Galen's life and work. *Physiologus*. Ed. F. Sbordone [Rome etc.: in Aedibus Societatis 'Dante Alighieri'; Albright, Segati e C., 1936. Pp. cxix+332] (Mras). The result of laborious research which deserves recognition and attention. *Aëtii Amideni libri medicinales I-IV*, ed. A. Olivieri [C.R. LI. 148] (Mewaldt). The first volume of a valuable addition to Greek medical texts. Ae. Decker: *Kenntnis und Pflege des Körpers bei Clemens von Alexandria* [Innsbruck: F. Rauch, 1936. Pp. 74] (de Boer). Competent work.

XIII. 8. AUGUST, 1937.

R. J. H. Jenkins: *Dedolica* [C.R. L. 233] (Matz). A careful collection of material of which the worth is well assessed. D. Krencker und M. Schede: *Der Tempel in Ankara* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1936. Pp. viii+61, 47 plates, 47 illustrations 2°] (Weigand). Contains some useful information; but W. argues against the conclusion that the date of the temple is c. 150 B.C. G. Bruns: *Der Obelisk und seine Basis auf dem Hippodrom zu Konstantinopel* [Stamboul, 1935 (Istanbuler Forschungen 7). Pp. 91, 89 illustrations 4°] (Kollwitz). An interesting book which would have been more useful had comparison been made with other monuments. A. Schober: *Die Römerzeit in Österreich* [Baden bei Wien: Rohrer, 1935. Pp. 109, 36 plates] (Koethe). Most valuable is the discussion of artistic questions. H. Junker: *Giza II, vol. 2: Die Mastabas der beginnenden 5. Dynastie auf dem Westfriedhof* [Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1934. Pp. 217, 16 plates, 34 illustrations 4°] (Brunner). An excellent piece of archaeological work in which only minor faults can be found. J. Brake: *Wirtschaften und Charakter in der antiken Bildung* [Frankfurt a. M.: Schulte-Bulmke, 1935. Pp. 151] (Hasebroek). May contribute to a better understanding of Greek society. W. Bauer: *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments . . .*, third edition revised [Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936. Pp. xii+1,490 columns] (Opitz). O. points out some mistakes, but calls it a most important aid to the study of the New Testament. *Apophoreta Gotoburgensia* [C.R. L. 157] (Kroll). An interesting collection of papers, some written in Latin, some in Swedish. *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, vols. 60 and 61 [C.R. XLIX. 117, 162; L. 161, 207] (Geissler). G. calls attention to a number of errors. K. Müller: *Die Epigramme des Antiphanes von Byzanz* [C.R. L. 129] (Wifstrand). Not good on linguistic and metrical points, but often illuminating about subject-matter. R. Johannemann: *Cicero und Pompejus . . .* [Diss. Münster, 1935. Pp. 88] (Mack). Spoilt by incompleteness and an uncritical use of evidence. G. Sörbom: *Variatio sermonis Tacitei . . .* [C.R. L. 73] (Köstermann). By accumulating examples S. often justifies suspected readings. G. Lemcke: *Die Varusschlacht* [Diss. Hamburg, 1936. Pp. 63] (Kornemann). L. proves that Florus's authority is worthless,

but ignores the important historical problems which are raised by his research. R. Andreotti: *Il Regno dell'Imperatore Giuliano* [Bologna: Zanichelli, 1936. Pp. 206] (Ensslin). Attractively written, but the detail is uncertain and the argument unconvincing. H. St. L. B. Moss: *The Birth of the Middle Ages* [C.R. L. 197] (Schenk). An important book. A. M. Schneider: *Byzanz* [Berlin: Deutsches Archäol. Inst., 1936. Pp. 106, 10 plates, 50 illustrations, 1 map] (Rice). Contains a useful summary of previous work and some valuable original studies. A. Nordh: *Prolegomena till den romerska regionskatalogen* [C.R. LI. 41] (Hanell). N.'s own theory about the nature of the book is not satisfactory, but his examination of previous theories and of the manuscripts is useful.

XIII. 9. SEPTEMBER, 1937.

R. von Scheliha: *Dion. Die Platonische Staatsgründung in Sizilien* [C.R. XLIX. 77] (Berve). B. rejects the portrait of Dion and disagrees with most of what Sch. says. A. Momigliano: *Filippo il Macedone* [C.R. L. 32] (Hampl). M. has done a great service in writing a scholarly monograph on Philip of Macedon. E. Kornemann: *Die Alexander-geschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten* [C.R. L. 137] (Strasburger). St. cannot accept the evidence which K. adduces and considers his examination of the sources mostly false. H. J. Rose: *A Handbook of Latin Literature* . . . [C.R. L. 246] (Hosius). H. surveys the scope of the book without enthusiasm; too little

is said about minor and lost literature. M. E. Peterlongo: *La Transazione nel Diritto Romano* [Milan: Giuffrè, 1936. Pp. 365] (Wieacker). A masterly book which for the first time treats the subject methodically and exhaustively. G. Karo: *Athen und Umgebung* [Berlin: Grieben-Verlag, 1937. Pp. 167, 7 maps and illustrations] (Kolbe). The guide is good. Kolbe discusses Karo's theory about the architectural history of the Parthenon. M. L. Bernhard: *Wazy Greckie w Museum E. Majewskiego w Warszawie* [C.R. LI. 87] (Kraiker). Good work which deserved a better subject. J. Wytzes: *Der Streit um den Altar der Viktoria* [C.R. L. 240] (Alföldi). A. points out faults but hopes that W. will continue to work in this field. A. Maddalena: *Per la definizione storica del 'De mortibus persecutorum'* [Venice: Ferrari, 1935. Pp. 32] (Baynes). M. rightly concludes that Lactantius wrote the treatise, but many of his arguments are untenable. G. Lazzati: *Teofilo d'Alessandria* [Milan: 'Vita e pensiero', 1934. Pp. v+111] (Opitz). The title is misleading and the book an unsuccessful attempt to realize an unsuitable object. A. Labhardt: *Contributions à la critique et à l'explication des Gloses de Reichenau* [Diss. Neuchâtel, 1936. Pp. ix+107] (Leumann). L.'s able work on the manuscript and the sources prepares the way for a new edition. A. Buck: *Der Platonismus in den Dichtungen Lorenzo de' Medici* [Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936. Pp. 114] (Gmelin). A sober survey of the problem.—Bibliographical Supplement 1937 Nr. 4 (down to August 31).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Blomgren (S.) *De sermone Ammiani Marcelini quaestiones variae*. Pp. 185. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1937: 6.) Uppsala: Lundequist, 1937. Paper, Kr. 5.75.
Boerma (J.) *Historischer Kommentar zu Justins Epitome Historiarum Philippicarum des Pompeius Trogus, I. XXVII-XXXIII, und zu den Prologi dieser Bücher*. Pp. vi+127. The Hague: printed by Huetinck, 1937. Paper, fl. 2.60.
Bonner (C.) *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek*. Pp. ix+106; 2 plates. (Studies and Documents edited by K. and S. Lake, VIII.) London: Christophers, 1937. Paper, 15s.
Cary (E.) *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, with an English translation by E. C. on the basis of the version of E. Spelman*. In 7 volumes. I. Pp. xlviii+553. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.)
Catholic University of America *Patristic Studies*. Vol. LI. *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome*, by M. C. Herron. Pp. xiv+132. Washington, D.C.:

Catholic University of America, 1937. Paper, \$2.
Catholic University of America *Patristic Studies*. Vol. LII. *Word-Order in the Works of St. Augustine*. By M. S. Muldowney. Pp. xxv+155. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1937. Paper, \$2.
Clarke (A. K.) *The Marriage of Peleus and Thetis*. A Poem. Pp. 33. Cambridge: Heffer, 1937. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
De Cola (M.) *Callimaco e Ovidio*. Pp. 131. (Studi Palermitani di Filologia Classica, 2.) Palermo: Trimarchi, 1937. Paper, L. 15.
del Grande (C.) *Poesia ermetica nella Grecia antica*. Pp. 83. Naples: Ricciardi, 1937. Paper, L. 10.
Deubner (L.) *Iamblichi de vita Pythagorica liber*. Edidit L. D. Pp. xx+158. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1937. Export prices: paper, RM. 6.60; bound, 7.50.
Dioniso. *Bollettino dell'Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico*. Vol. VI—n.2. Syracuse, 1937. L. 5.

- Drabkin** (N. L.) *The Medea Exul of Ennius*. Pp. 94. Geneva (New York): W. P. Humphrey Press, 1937. Paper.
- Elg** (A. G.) *In Faustum Reensem studia*. Pp. xiv+156. Uppsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1937. Paper.
- Ferckel** (F.) *Lysias und Athen (Des Redners politische Stellung zum Gaststaat)*. Pp. viii+164. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1937. Paper.
- Goodwin** (A. J. H.) *Communication has been established*. Pp. xi+268; 2 plates, 15 text illustrations. London: Methuen, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Gulick** (C. B.) *Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists. With an English translation. In seven volumes. VI.* Pp. xi+548. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.
- Heuss** (A.) *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus in ihren staats- und völkerrechtlichen Beziehungen*. Pp. xi+273. (Klio, 39. Beiheft.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1937. Paper, M. 19.25 (bound, 21).
- Kase** (E. H.) *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections. Vol. II.* Pp. xi+130; 10 plates. Princeton: University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 14s.
- Lambrechts** (P.) *La composition du sénat romain de Septime Sévère à Dioclétien (193-284)*. Pp. 130. (Dissertationes Pannonicae, Ser. I. Fasc. 8.) Budapest: Institut de Numismatique et d'Archéologie de l'Université Pierre Pázmány, 1937. Paper, Pengő 12.
- Loth** (H. E.) *A Study of the Lexicography of the Casus Sancti Galli of Ekkehardus IV.* Pp. vii+153. Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, 1936. Paper.
- Lynn** (C.) *A College Professor of the Renaissance. Lucio Marineo Sículo among the Spanish Humanists*. Pp. xi+302; frontispiece. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1937. Cloth, 13s. 6d.
- Macgregor** (M.) *Studies and Diversions in Greek Literature*. Pp. viii+307. London: Arnold, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Markowski** (H.) *Diatagma Kaisaros de Caesare Manium iurum vindice*. Pp. 119; 6 photographs. (Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, Prace Komisji Filologicznej, Tom VIII. Zeszyt 2.) Poznań, 1937. Paper.
- Meagher** (L.) *The Gellius Manuscript of Lupus of Ferrières*. Pp. iv+96; 2 plates. Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, 1936. Paper.
- Mörne** (H.) *The Melting Pot*. Pp. 243. London: Hodge, 1937. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Nachmanson** (E.) *Mommsen och Sverige. Några Brev utgivna och kommenterade*. Pp. 36. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XLIII 1937: 3.) Göteborg: Wettergren och Kerber. Paper, Kr. 2.
- Norberg** (D.) *In registrum Gregorii Magni studia critica*. Pp. xv+175. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift 1937: 4.) Uppsala: Lundequist, 1937. Paper, Kr. 6.
- Nybakken** (O. E.) *An Analytical Study of Horace's Ideas*. Pp. 124. (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. V.) State University of Iowa, 1937. Paper. \$1.50.
- Oppel** (H.) *KANON. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seiner lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula-norma)*. Pp. xiv+108. (Philologus Supplementband XXX, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1935. Paper, M. 8 (bound, 9.50).
- Peck** (A. L.) and **Forster** (E. S.) *Aristotle: Parts of Animals, with an English translation by A. L. P.; Movements of Animals, Progression of Animals, with an E. t. by E. S. F.* Pp. 556. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Premierstein** (A. von) *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*. Pp. xii+290. (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Ph.-h. Abt., N.F., Heft 15.) Munich: Beck, 1937.
- Rini** (A.) *Petronius in Italy from the Thirteenth Century to the Present Time*. Pp. vii+181. New York: Cappabianca Press, 1937. Cloth.
- Rodgers** (W. L.) *Greek and Roman Naval Warfare. A Study of Strategy, Tactics, and Ship Design from Salamis (480 B.C.) to Actium (31 B.C.)*. Pp. xv+555; illustrations and 28 maps. United States Naval Institute, Annapolis, Maryland (London: B. F. Stevens and Brown), 1937. Cloth, 27s.
- Rouse** (W. H. D.) *The Story of Odysseus. A translation of Homer's 'Odyssey' into plain English*. Pp. xv+463. London etc.: Nelson, 1937. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Snell** (B.) *Euripides Alexandros und andere Strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter*. Pp. vii+111. (Hermes, Einzelschriften, Heft 5.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1937. Paper, RM. 9.60.
- Specka** (A.) *Der hohe Stil der Dichtungen Senecas und Lucans*. Pp. 73. Stallupönen: Klutke, 1937. Paper.
- Stiebitz** (F.) *Biologické Základy antických Názorů o Dědičnosti. Antiquitatis de hereditate opinionum fundamenta biologica*. Pp. vi+229. (Spisy Filosofické Fakulty Masarykovy University v Brně, Číslo 44.) Brno: Píša, 1937. Kč 30.
- Stöcklein** (P.) *Ueber die philosophische Bedeutung von Platons Mythen*. Pp. viii+58. (Philologus Supplementband XXX, Heft 3.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1937. Paper, M. 4.50.
- Sutherland** (C. H. V.) *Coinage and Currency in Roman Britain*. Pp. xii+184; 14 plates. London: Milford, 1937. Cloth, 10s. 6d.
- Thackeray** (H. St. J.) and **Marcus** (R.) *Josephus. With an English translation. In nine volumes. VI.* by R. M. Jewish Antiquities, Books IX-XI. Pp. xi+532. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1937. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).
- Trevelyan** (R. C.) *Lucretius De Rerum Natura. Translated by R. C. T.* Pp. xv+295. Cambridge: University Press, 1937. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Wethered** (H. N.) *The Mind of the Ancient World. A Consideration of Pliny's Natural History*. Pp. xv+302; frontispiece. London, etc.: Longmans, 1937. Cloth, 12s. 6d.